

Calendar No. 626

97TH CONGRESS }
2d Session }

SENATE

{ REPORT
No. 97-440

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION FISCAL YEAR 1983

MAY 27 (legislative day, MAY 25), 1982.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. THURMOND, from the Committee on Armed Services,
submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. 2586]

The Committee on Armed Services, having had under consideration the question of military construction authorization for fiscal year 1983, reports the following bill (S. 2586), to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes and recommends that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to provide construction and other related authority for the military departments, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense, within and outside the United States, in the total amount of \$6,435,506,000.

AUTHORIZATIONS GRANTED

Authorizations granted are set forth in the table below:

Total authorizations granted, fiscal year 1983

Title I (Army):	
Inside the United States.....	\$372,090,000
Outside the United States.....	367,240,000
Minor construction	49,950,000
Family housing and homeowners assistance	953,478,000
Subtotal	1,742,758,000
Title II (Navy):	
Inside the United States.....	735,190,000
Outside the United States.....	155,820,000
94-436 O	

S203-3

Title II (Navy)—Con.	
Minor construction	55,938,000
Family housing	668,013,000
Subtotal	1,614,961,000
Title III (Air Force):	
Inside the United States	810,250,000
Outside the United States	520,998,000
Minor construction	90,974,000
Family housing	826,535,000
Subtotal	2,248,757,000
Title IV (Defense Agencies):	
Inside the United States	125,241,000
Outside the United States	94,457,000
Minor construction	9,620,000
Emergency construction	5,200,000
Family housing	17,312,000
Subtotal	251,830,000
Title V (NATO infrastructure)	375,000,000
Title VII (Guard and Reserve Forces):	
Army National Guard	33,000,000
Army Reserve	28,500,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve	21,900,000
Air National Guard	89,800,000
Air Force Reserve	29,000,000
Subtotal	202,200,000
Grand total	6,435,506,000

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ACTION

The Department of Defense requested \$7,811,164,000 in new authority to construct over 1,000 projects at military installations throughout the United States and at overseas bases.

The Subcommittee on Military Construction heard testimony from Department of Defense officials, from Service representatives, and from certain outside witnesses at five different hearings during the week of April 19, 1982. Special presentations were received on the high cost, special interest programs being requested.

After carefully reviewing each project, the committee made certain adjustments to the budget request. The following table summarizes committee action:

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

	Budget request	Committee approved	Difference	
			Amount	Percent
Title I—Army	\$2,051,593	\$1,742,758	—\$308,835	15
Title II—Navy	1,909,293	1,614,961	—294,332	15
Title III—Air Force	2,867,682	2,248,757	—618,925	22
Title IV—Defense agencies	405,396	251,830	—153,566	38
Title V—NATO infrastructure	375,000	375,000	0	0
Title VII—Reserve Forces	202,200	202,200	0	0
Total	7,811,164	6,435,506	—1,375,658	18

AREAS OF SPECIAL EMPHASIS

REDUCTIONS IN BUDGET REQUEST

In order to accommodate action by the Senate in establishing a budget ceiling for the national defense function for fiscal year 1983, the Armed Services Committee agreed that reductions of approximately \$1.4 billion in budget authority and \$200 million in associated outlays must be made in the military construction request. In deciding how to effect these reductions, the committee agreed on several basic premises.

First, no projects, which had not been included in the budget request, have been considered to be added to the bill. Normally, the committee makes certain reductions for various reasons and then adds some high priority, unbudgeted projects within budgetary constraints. The budget situation this year does not permit the consideration of any unbudgeted projects.

Second, the committee agreed to defer without prejudice those projects which it felt could safely be deferred without severely impacting readiness. The committee has deferred community, morale and welfare, administrative, supply, and laboratory facilities; while generally approving operational, bachelor housing, medical, maintenance, energy, and pollution abatement facilities.

Third, the committee has deferred without prejudice all new military family housing construction and all improvements to existing military family housing, except those improvements related to energy conservation. The committee believed that this construction could be safely deferred without damage to military preparedness. In addition, the Defense Department had sought for the first time in many years to build substantial numbers of new military family housing units at overseas locations and the committee has some concern about embarking on a major construction program to build new family housing overseas. The cost proposed for such housing (over \$100,000 per unit) is very high and if the Department elects to pursue construction of family housing overseas next year, the committee will expect full and complete justification.

Finally, the committee has deferred or denied other projects where the justification was insufficient or where the funds could not be spent in fiscal year 1983.

CONSTRUCTION IN EUROPE

Construction in Europe continues to constitute a major portion of the military construction program. Again this year, well over one billion dollars will be spent for construction in support of our forces deployed in NATO. Despite greatly increased construction expenditures in recent years, the backlog of requirements for construction in Europe continues to grow. The growing construction requirements in Europe cannot continue to be addressed solely through increases in unilateral U.S. funding; the Defense Department must aggressively seek alternative funding sources which rely more heavily on allied burden sharing. The United States has

undertaken security commitments in Southwest Asia which will require a large commitment of U.S. resources and our European allies will benefit from such commitments. A corresponding increase in allied funding to support U.S. forces deployed in NATO is required. The committee will expect to see new initiatives in this area when it considers the military construction budget next year.

The committee notes that some progress is being made in negotiations with the Federal Republic of Germany regarding the Master Restationing Plan—a plan to relocate three U.S. Army brigades into new facilities nearer the East German border. The committee supports this initiative and encourages the Defense Department to press the FRG to fund the entire cost of the Master Restationing Plan. The committee has agreed to authorize certain projects in this bill in support of the Master Restationing Plan subject to the successful conclusion of negotiations that includes a satisfactory cost-sharing arrangement.

CONSTRUCTION IN SUPPORT OF THE RAPID DEPLOYMENT FORCE

The committee supports the requirement for the earliest possible construction of facilities to enable the Rapid Deployment Force to react quickly to emergencies in Southwest Asia.

The committee is satisfied that, with the exception of Lajes Air Force Base, the necessary bilateral arrangements are now in force to reasonably insure that U.S. forces would have access to these facilities when they are needed.

President Sadat's letter of July 27, 1981, and subsequent oral assurances by both President Sadat and President Mubarak offering the use of Ras Banas are sufficient to permit construction to proceed at Ras Banas. Requiring additional written assurances would be counter productive.

The only remaining issue should be how rapidly the Services can accomplish the construction that has been authorized. The committee would expect the Services to execute this construction program with the same intensity that characterized the recent highly successful effort to build two Israeli Air Bases in support of the Israeli-Egyptian peace accord.

LONG RANGE SECURITY PROGRAM

The committee was distressed to learn that previously authorized construction projects to provide for the increased physical security of chemical and nuclear weapons storage sites are not yet completed, and the execution of these projects, especially the installation of electronic surveillance and security measures, appears to have been badly mismanaged. The committee considers this situation intolerable and calls on the Defense Department to institute intensive management oversight procedures to get this effort completed. The committee requests that a quarterly letter report, starting July 1, 1982, and continuing until the program is completed, be provided to include the status of this program and the efforts being taken to get the projects completed.

SMALL BUSINESS SET ASIDES FOR ARCHITECT-ENGINEERS

The committee heard testimony from the architect-engineer community and from several professional engineering societies express-

ing concern with current Defense Department procedures for setting aside architect-engineer contracts for "small businesses". According to testimony provided to the committee, there are some 30,000 architect-engineer firms in the United States today and the average size firm has 10-12 employees. However, the Small Business Agency has defined a "small business" architect-engineer firm as one with annual billings of up to \$7.5 million. As a result of this definition, of the 30,000 architect-engineer firms in existence today, all but about the top 200 firms qualify as "small businesses". Recent Defense regulations require that architect-engineer contracts be awarded to "small businesses" if two or more qualified "small businesses" are competitive. This practice is threatening serious consequences for the overall architect-engineer community.

First, the top 200 firms which do not qualify as "small businesses" under the SBA definition will be virtually excluded from Defense design contracts. There are very few Defense design contracts that cannot be accomplished by architect-engineer firms with billings of up to \$7.5 million a year. \$7.5 million in design equates to a construction project of \$125 million using the normal design-to-construction cost ratio of 6 percent. Very few Defense Department construction projects exceed \$125 million. The committee does not want to see the top 200 firms excluded from Defense construction design work. In time of mobilization it is these large firms that the Department would have to call upon to support defense mobilization requirements and they should retain some familiarity with Defense requirements and procedures. In addition, most of these top 200 firms operate branches in several cities and each of these branch offices, which may well have billings of less than \$7.5 million a year, must show a profit. However, under current rules one of these branch offices may be forbidden to compete with a "small business" firm which may actually be larger in that location.

Second, the current procedures are actually biased against truly small architect-engineer firms. An average size firm of 10 to 12 employees must compete with a firm of up to 200 employees, since both are by definition "small businesses". The truly small architect-engineer firms have little hope of getting any Defense design work.

The committee feels that this situation requires the immediate attention of the Defense Department. The committee does not feel that it is appropriate at this time to specify with precision how much design work should be set aside for "small business" architect-engineers and what the definition of a "small business" architect-engineer firm should be. However, the committee expects the Department to review this situation and to insure that large architect-engineer firms continue to get a reasonable share of the Defense design work and that truly small architect-engineer firms are given a reasonable opportunity to compete for appropriately-sized Defense design projects.

The committee requests that the Defense Department provide a report on the review and findings with respect to this issue by January 1, 1983.

COMMISSARY CONSTRUCTION

All commissary construction is now funded through a surcharge paid by military patrons at the checkout counter. This procedure which was instituted in 1975 has worked well and all of the Services have a major commissary upgrade program underway.

Despite this program, all of the Services have significant backlogs of commissary construction requirements. Heretofore, the Services have deposited surcharge monies in a fund until sufficient moneys were accrued to obligate the entire cost of a new commissary construction project. The committee has included a provision (Section 802) designed to accelerate the commissary construction programs by about one year. In essence, this provision allows the Services to contract for commissary construction in advance of the actual receipt of surcharge funds and to do business on a "cash flow" basis. The committee emphasizes that commissary construction will continue to be paid for by military patrons; contracting will simply be on a more "business-like" basis.

The committee notes that commissaries remain a substantial benefit to military patrons. According to information provided by the Services, commissary patrons realize an average cost savings of 25 percent. The committee believes that an increase of a few percent in the surcharge rate to further accelerate the commissary construction program would not unduly erode the commissary benefit now enjoyed by military personnel. That option remains available to the Military Departments.

WORLD WAR II CONSTRUCTION

Many military installations have mobilization facilities, built before and during World War II, which are being retained for various purposes. These facilities, built of wood with an expected life of 5 years, are now 40 years old. They are dangerous because they burn like paper and have no fire protection features, they are energy extravagant, they are operationally inefficient, they are costly to maintain, and they are an eyesore. And yet, the Services keep these buildings in the inventory and in some instances the Services are planning to spend substantial sums to upgrade these facilities.

The committee believes that to keep these facilities in the inventory and to spend substantial sums upgrading them is false economy. The committee calls upon each of the Services to develop a plan to get World War II temporary facilities out of the inventory. Such a plan should:

1. Set a target date of 1990 to complete the demolition of such facilities.
2. Limit any further expenditures on such facilities to the minimum necessary.
3. Select an off-the-shelf, pre-engineered standard, steel frame building to be used to replace World War II wooden facilities where necessary and develop a schedule for building such replacement facilities.

The Department of Defense should develop and promulgate implementing guidance for the development of such a plan. In addition, the Department is requested to review such plans and furnish

a summary of such plans, together with appropriate comments, to the committee by January 1, 1983.

ARMY BARRACKS DESIGN

The Army has decided that the standard barracks designs used since the middle 1970s are no longer desirable. The existing design contributes to command and control problems and the three-man room configuration is unsatisfactory. As a result the Army convened a board to develop a new design concept. Although not finally approved, a new design concept has been proposed which will result in construction cost savings of several dollars per square foot and which is more energy efficient. This new design concept has been applied to barracks projects at Fort Bragg, North Carolina and Fort Story, Virginia. The committee has approved these projects as a pilot effort.

In addition to the barracks projects mentioned above, the Army proposed to build barracks at several other locations using the old standard design. The committee has deferred these projects, since they would be more costly to build and to maintain and since the Army has decided that such design is unsatisfactory. The committee directs that these projects be redesigned and resubmitted in future years, if appropriate.

MANAGEMENT OF DEFENSE REAL PROPERTY

The purpose of section 804 is to encourage the Defense Department to manage its real property assets in a fashion that reduces costs and promotes efficient operations.

The procedures in effect today involving the management of defense real property are complex, cumbersome, and, in general, promote the status quo. The Defense Department cannot sell land; they may only report it as excess to the General Services Administration (GSA) for further disposal under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949. The Defense Department realizes no benefit from such a transaction and is often required to maintain the property and the necessary security force for several years while the GSA process is carried out. Current procedures are a major disincentive to proper land management.

Under the provisions of this section, the Department of Defense is permitted to manage its lands just as any large corporation might. Authority is provided for any Defense lands to be sold or exchanged if such sale or exchange is in the public interest or necessary for national defense purposes. Such sale must be done under publicly advertised, competitively bid procedures unless there are extenuating circumstances and the committee would expect to see exceptions only in rare, unusual situations. Exchanges normally would be negotiated. Any sale or exchange under this section must at least "break even" or "show a profit"; subsection (e) does not permit a transaction where the costs of the transaction exceed the amount to be realized from the sale or exchange.

The purpose of this section goes beyond the objective of merely encouraging the Defense Department to sell excess lands. More importantly, it encourages the Department to look for better ways of managing its resources. Consolidations and moves from high cost,

inefficient locations will be encouraged if these actions can be paid for out of sales proceeds.

Careful congressional oversight is maintained by requiring that any transaction involving more than \$100,000 be reported to the Committees on Armed Services.

The incentive devices provided are two. In addition to permitting costs to be covered out of proceeds, any "profit" will be credited to the appropriate Services' military construction appropriation account—just as any big business would be permitted to keep and reinvest profits from comparable transactions. This will permit the annual military construction appropriations requests to be reduced which will have the net effect of reducing overall Defense requirements.

This section complements and enhances the administration's program under Executive Order 12348 to reduce the national debt by selling federal property. Using the sale proceeds to offset in part the need for new Defense construction appropriations also reduces the national debt—just as applying the proceeds directly toward debt reduction would. However, this section should result in greater returns to the taxpayers because the incentives provided will increase the number of Defense properties that will be made available for sale or exchange.

BUDGET ESTIMATE

In compliance with the Budget Reform Act, the Congressional Budget Office has furnished the following budget estimate.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, D.C. May 21, 1982.

Hon. JOHN TOWER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to Section 403 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Congressional Budget Office has prepared the attached cost estimate for the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1983, as ordered reported on May 20, 1982.

Should the committee so desire, we would be pleased to provide further details on this estimate.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND C. SCHEPPACH
(For Alice M. Rivlin, Director.)

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE—MAY 21, 1982

1. Bill number: Not yet assigned.
2. Bill title: Military Construction Authorization Act, 1983.
3. Bill status: As ordered reported by the Senate Armed Services Committee on May 20, 1982.
4. Bill purpose: This bill authorizes construction at military installations, operation of family housing, and the appropriation of funds for these purposes.
5. Cost estimate:

[By fiscal year, in million of dollars]

	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987
Authorization level.....	42	6,438				
Estimated outlays.....		1,990	2,122	1,394	691	225

The costs of this bill fall within function 050. See Table I for detail.

6. Basis of estimate: Generally, the authorization amounts are as stated in the bill. The 1982 authorization amounts correspond to deficiency authorizations for construction projects in fiscal years 1976, and 1977. The authorization amounts used in this estimate are the difference between what is currently authorized and what is provided in this bill.

Section 602 (b) authorizes appropriations pursuant to pay raises under current law. This estimate assumes a 7.0 percent pay raise that would increase the authorization by about \$2.6. million.

The bill estimates assume that the authorization amounts will be appropriated in full and available for obligation by October 1, 1982. Outlays are estimated according to historical patterns for similar activities.

7. Estimate comparison: None.

8. Previous CBO estimate: None.

9. Estimate prepared by: Thomas D. Phillips.

10. Estimate approved by:

JAMES L. BLUM,
Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

BUDGET IMPACT FOR AUTHORIZATION THROUGH 1983

[In thousands of dollars]

	Authorization amount		Estimated outlays				
	1982	1983	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987
Title I:							
Military construction, Army.....	789,280	52,092	276,248	236,784	118,392	78,928	
Family housing:							
Construction.....	43,800	438	10,950	17,520	11,826	2,190	
Support.....	905,678	635,605	229,680	31,155			
Homeowners assistance.....	4,000	4,000					
1976 authorization amendment.....	28	2	10	8	4	3	
Title II:							
Military construction, Navy.....	946,948	133,520	305,864	308,705	173,954	24,905	
Family housing:							
Construction.....	8,574	86	2,144	3,430	2,315	429	
Support.....	659,439	462,794	167,234	22,685			
Title III:							
Military construction, Air Force.....	1,422,272	76,803	540,463	469,350	256,009	79,647	
Family housing:							
Construction.....	17,000	170	4,250	6,800	4,590	850	
Support.....	809,535	568,132	205,298	27,848			
1977 deficiency authorization.....	42,000	2,268	15,960	13,860	7,560	2,352	
Title IV:							
Military construction, defense agencies.....	234,518	7,036	86,772	93,807	28,142	14,071	
Family housing:							
Construction.....	33		8	13	9	2	
Support.....	17,279	12,126	4,382	594			
Title V: NATO infrastructure.....	375,000	18,750	150,000	112,500	75,000	18,750	

BUDGET IMPACT FOR AUTHORIZATION THROUGH 1983—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Authorization amount		Estimated outlays				
	1982	1983	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987
Title VI: Anticipated pay raise		2,646	2,603	42			
Title VII:							
Military construction:							
Army National Guard		33,000	1,980	22,770	4,950	2,310	759
Army Reserve		28,500	1,425	12,825	9,975	2,565	855
Navy and Marine Corps Reserves		21,900	1,533	7,665	8,541	1,971	1,752
Air National Guard		89,800	5,388	61,962	17,960	4,490	
Air Force Reserve		29,000	2,900	17,400	7,250	1,450	
Total	42,028	6,438,202	1,989,651	2,121,927	1,393,735	690,587	225,493

¹ Totals may not add due to rounding.

REGULATORY IMPACT

Paragraph 5 or rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate requires that a report of the regulatory impact of a bill be included in the report on such bill. The committee finds that in the case of this bill there is no regulatory impact.

COMMITTEE ACTION

On May 20, 1982, the Senate Committee on Armed Services, a quorum being present, voted unanimously to report the bill favorably, as amended.

TITLE I—ARMY

The Army request under title I of the bill amounted to \$2,051,593,000. The committee, after careful review and consideration of the Army request, approves the following programs.

	Army request	Committee approved
Military construction	\$962,140,000	\$789,280,000
Family housing	1,089,453,000	953,478,000
Total	2,051,593,000	1,742,758,000

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

The Army presented an authorization request for appropriations for the Military Construction, Army, program as follows:

MAJOR COMMAND SUMMARY

[In thousands of dollars]

Major command	Army request	Committee approved
Inside the United States:		
U.S. Army Forces Command	176,930	133,430
U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command	145,850	101,450
U.S. Army Materiel Development and Readiness Command	77,700	77,700
Army ammunition plants	25,680	25,080
U.S. Army Communications Command	7,550	0
U.S. Army Health Service Command	15,100	11,500
U.S. Army Western Command	20,730	2,930
Ballistic Missile Defense Systems Command	20,000	20,000
Total, inside the United States	489,540	372,090
Outside the United States:		
Eighth U.S. Army	68,300	57,850
Ballistic Missile Defense Systems Command	21,600	0
U.S. Army Forces Command	6,800	6,800
U.S. Army, Europe	255,140	244,590
U.S. Army Western Command	1,050	1,050
Rapid Deployment Force	53,000	53,000
U.S. Army Communications Command	3,950	3,950
Total, outside the United States	409,840	367,240
Minor construction	62,760	49,950
Total	962,140	789,280

FACILITY CATEGORY SUMMARY

(In thousands of dollars)

Facility category	Army request	Committee approved
Operations and training.....	189,460	174,210
Maintenance and production	233,870	233,870
Army ammunition plants.....	25,680	25,080
Research, development, test, and evaluation.....	32,050	5,500
Supply.....	3,550	3,550
Medical.....	54,850	49,050
Administrative.....	1,100	0
Housing and community.....	264,670	155,570
Utilities and ground improvements.....	94,150	92,500
Minor construction.....	62,760	59,950
Total.....	962,140	789,280

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

The committee approved \$4,350,000 for two water pollution abatement projects. The projects are listed with the appropriate command's projects.

ENERGY CONSERVATION INVESTMENT PROGRAM

The committee approved \$17,540,000 for 20 energy conservation investment projects. The projects are listed with the appropriate command's projects or in the minor construction section.

CORRECTION OF OSHA DEFICIENCIES

The committee approved \$14,790,000 for four OSHA projects. The projects are listed with the appropriate command's projects or in the minor construction section.

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

U.S. ARMY FORCES COMMAND

The U.S. Army Forces Command (FORSCOM) has command responsibility for the units, installations, and activities that are principally related to readiness and defense missions. It has command readiness responsibility for the bulk of the deployable troop units in the Army and is responsible for organizing, training, equipping, and insuring the combat readiness of assigned troop units.

The committee approved \$133,430,000 for 35 projects at the following 14 locations:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Fort Bragg, N.C.....	Barracks with dining facility.....	\$15,470
	Electrical distribution system.....	5,300
	Tactical equipment shop.....	2,300
Total.....		23,070
Fort Campbell, Ky.....	Flight simulator building.....	2,850

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
	Tactical equipment shop	7,800
Total		10,650
Fort Carson, Colo	Tactical equipment shop	1,550
	Combined range	2,500
	Rail loading facilities	2,800
	Access road	1,850
Total		8,700
Fort Devens Mass	Training area	3,200
Fort Hood, Tex	Tactical equipment shop	4,100
Fort Irwin, Calif	Training ranges	1,540
	Road improvements	13,000
	Dining facility	2,550
	Vehicle wash facilities	2,100
Total		19,190
Fort Lewis, Wash	Helicopter hanger	7,400
	do	7,500
	Aircraft parking apron	2,800
	Tactical equipment shop	2,900
	do	1,100
Total		21,700
Fort Meade, Md	Satellite control facility	2,500
Fort Ord, Calif	Tactical equipment shop	3,200
	Correct safety deficiencies	2,100
	Hardstand expansion	1,400
Total		6,700
Fort Polk, La	Tactical equipment shop	2,950
	do	1,650
	do	5,500
Total		10,100
Camp Roberts, Calif	Satellite control facility	2,050
Fort Stewart, Ga	Sewerage system extension	1,250
	Road net and drainage improvement	8,300
	Range upgrade	1,950
	Tactical equipment shop	5,700
Total		17,200
Fort Wainwright, Alaska	Control tower	1,670
	Range and training facility improvement	1,350
Total		3,020
Yakima Firing Center, Wash	Firing range roads	1,250

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Fort Bragg, N.C	Company administration and supply	¹ 2,050
Fort Carson, Colo	Battalion headquarters and classroom	¹ 1,450

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Fort Carson, Colo.—Con.		
	Company administration and supply	¹ 1,750
Total		3,200
Fort Hood, Tex.		
	Battalion headquarters and classroom	¹ 1,500
	Company administration and supply	¹ 2,350
Total		3,850
Fort Irwin, Calif.		
	Company administration and supply	¹ 2,400
	Modernize miscellaneous facilities	¹ 2,000
	Outdoor playing courts and fields	¹ 2,250
	Physical fitness center	¹ 5,500
Total		12,150
Fort Ord, Calif.		
	Troop medical clinic	² 5,800
	Barracks	³ 2,200
Total		8,000
Fort Polk, La.		
	Company administration and supply	² 4,300
	Battalion headquarters and classroom	¹ 2,450
Total		6,750
Fort Stewart, Ga.		
	Barracks	³ 5,800
Yakima Firing Center, Wash.		
	Gymnasium	¹ 1,700

¹ Deferred without prejudice.² Use prior authorization.³ Redesign using new standard.

U.S. ARMY TRAINING AND DOCTRINE COMMAND

The U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) is responsible for the Army school system and the principal combat development activities of the Army. It is responsible for individual training for members of the active Army and for Army Reserve component personnel assigned to TRADOC schools and activities.

The committee approved \$101,450,000 for 14 projects at the following nine locations:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Fort Benning, Ga.	Infantry/cavalry fighting vehicle range	\$15,500
Fort Bliss, Tex.		
	Training facility	6,700
	Tactical equipment shop	8,400
	do	6,200
Total		21,300
Fort Eustis, Va.	Aviation training facility	6,400
Fort Knox, Ky.		
	Tank driving course	2,900
	Sanitary landfill	3,000
	Correct safety deficiencies	2,500
Total		8,400
Fort Leavenworth, Kans.	Hospital upgrade	13,600
Fort Leonard Wood, Mo.	Maintenance Division complex	11,000

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Fort McClellan, Ala.....	Decontamination training facility.....	7,500
Fort Rucker, Ala.....	Dining facility.....	1,650
	Training facilities.....	2,300
Total.....		3,950
Fort Story, Va.....	Barracks with dining facility.....	13,800

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Fort Leavenworth, Kans.....	Gymnasium.....	¹ 3,400
	Addition to Bell Hall.....	¹ 4,200
	Unaccompanied officer quarters.....	¹ 23,000
Total.....		30,600
Fort Rucker, Ala.....	Barracks.....	² 11,700
	Company administration and supply.....	¹ 2,100
Total.....		13,800

¹ Deferred without prejudice.

² Redesign using new standard.

U.S. ARMY MATERIEL DEVELOPMENT AND READINESS COMMAND

The U.S. Army Materiel Development and Readiness Command (DARCOM) is responsible for integrated, systemized management of the Army's wholesale materiel activities. The wholesale activities responsibilities range from research through acquisition and distribution to disposal.

The committee approved \$77,700,000 for six projects at the following five locations:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.....	Training facilities.....	\$9,400
Pine Bluff Arsenal, Ark.....	Binary munitions facility.....	18,300
	Contain hazardous chemical runoff.....	1,350
Total.....		19,650
Red River Army Depot, Tex.....	Maintenance modernization.....	39,000
Toole Army Depot, Utah.....	Solid waste incinerator.....	4,150
White Sands Missile Range, N. Mex.....	Launch Complex.....	5,500

ARMY AMMUNITION PLANTS

Army ammunition plants are used to produce conventional ammunition in support of war reserve, consumption, and training re-

quirements including support to the other Services and selected allies.

The committee approved \$25,080,000 for 13 projects at the following eight locations:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Indiana AAP, Ind.....	Power tie-line.....	\$2,600
	Energy power source.....	310
	Total.....	2,910
Iowa AAP, Iowa.....	Explosive storage building with walkway.....	310
	Truck dock and storage area.....	120
	Total.....	430
Kansas AAP, Kans.....	Plant operations center.....	7,200
	Longhorn AAP, Tex.....	230
Louisiana AAP, La.....	Container distribution facility.....	3,050
	Gas and diesel dispensing station.....	220
	Water well buildings.....	140
	Total.....	3,410
Milan AAP, Tenn.....	Rehabilitation of K-10 boiler plant.....	5,500
Radford AAP, Va.....	Replace barricades.....	1,850
	120mm propellant paste aging facility.....	550
Sunflower AAP, Kans.....	Total.....	2,400
	Restore 300-ton/day ammonia oxidation plant.....	3,000

The committee did not authorize the following project:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Iowa AAP, Iowa.....	Improve T-barricade at railroad dock.....	¹ \$600

¹ Project scope being revised.

U.S. ARMY COMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

The U.S. Army Communications Command (USACC) has worldwide responsibilities for engineering, installing, operating, and maintaining the Army portion of the Defense Communications System and for providing, operating, and maintaining the Army's communications-electronics facilities.

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Fort Huachuca, Ariz.....	Child care center.....	¹ \$2,600
	Electromagnetic test facilities.....	² 4,950
Total.....		7,550

¹ Deierred without prejudice.

² Use prior authorization.

U.S. ARMY HEALTH SERVICES COMMAND

The U.S. Army Health Services Command (HSC) is responsible for providing Army health services to authorized recipients in the United States and its territories. It is the principal proponent and developer of concepts, doctrine, materiel requirements, and organizations for the health care system for the Army in field environments.

The committee approved \$11,500,000 for two projects at the following two locations:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Fort Detrick, Md	Communications system facilities	\$1,700
Walter Reed Army Med Ctr, D.C.	Heating and cooling upgrade	9,800

The committee did not authorize the following project:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Fitzsimons Army Med Ctr, Colo	Barracks	¹ \$3,600

¹ Redesign using new standard.

U.S. ARMY WESTERN COMMAND

The commander of the U.S. Army Western Command (WEST-COM) commands and supports assigned and attached Active and Army Reserve units, installations and activities in Hawaii and possessions and trust territories in the Pacific administered by the U.S.

The committee approved \$2,930,000 for one project at the following location:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Schofield Barracks, Hawaii	Tactical equipment shop	\$2,930

The committee did not authorize the following project:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Schofield Barracks, Hawaii	Barracks with dining facility	¹ \$17,800

¹ Redesign using new standard.

BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS COMMAND

The mission of the Ballistic Missile Defense Systems Command (BMDSC) is to coordinate and control all work and associated resources in testing and logistical support involved in developing effective ballistic missile defense systems.

The committee approved \$20,000,000 for one project at a classified location:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Classified location	Aircraft hangar	\$20,000

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

EIGHTH U.S. ARMY

The Eighth U.S. Army provides administrative, medical, and logistical support for U.S. Army units assigned to Korea.

The committee approved \$57,850,000 for 13 projects in Korea:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Various locations, Korea.....	Tactical equipment shops	\$9,600
	Direct support maintenance facility	5,500
	Tactical equipment shop	7,100
	Emergency operations center	2,150
	Water distribution and fire protection	1,700
	Electrical system upgrade	4,600
	Water system upgrade	3,900
	Barracks	1,900
	Dining facility	4,050
	Upgrade power distribution	1,550
	Troop medical clinic	3,800
	Sewer system upgrade	9,900
	Barracks	2,100

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Various locations, Korea.....	Monobuoy System, Pohang	¹ \$3,350
	Chapel and community activities center	² 1,100
	Gymnasium with pool	² 2,350
	Theater with stage	² 1,050
	Gymnasium	² 2,600

¹ Problem with monobuoy availability.

² Deferred without prejudice.

BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS COMMAND

The mission of the Ballistic Missile Defense Systems Command (BMDSC) is to coordinate and control all work and associated resources in testing and logistical support involved in developing effective ballistic missile defense systems.

The committee did not authorize the following project:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Kwajalein	Launch complex	¹ \$21,600

¹ The committee deferred the project without prejudice due to uncertainty that the level of R. & D. authorization for the ballistic missile defense program would require construction in fiscal year 1983.

U.S. ARMY FORCES COMMAND

The U.S. Army Forces Command has command responsibility for the units, installations, and activities that are principally related to readiness and defense missions. It has command readiness responsibility for the bulk of the deployable troop units in the Army and is responsible for organizing, training, equipping, and insuring the combat readiness of assigned troop units.

The committee approved \$6,800,000 for three projects in Panama:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Ancon	Hospital Alteration	\$2,650
Fort Davis	Barracks with dining facility	1,350
Corozal	Barracks modification	2,800

U.S. ARMY, EUROPE

The U.S. Army, Europe, provides administrative, medical, and logistical support for the U.S. Army, Europe, and the Seventh Army.

The committee approved \$244,590,000 for 51 projects located in Germany and Turkey:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Germany:		
Bamburg	Barracks	\$2,200
	Maintenance facility	2,100
Total		4,300
Baumholder	Temperature controls	1,250
	Barracks with dining facility	1,100
Total		2,350
Bremerhaven	Hospital renovation	29,000
Dexheim	Barracks with dining facility	14,600

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Germany—Con.		
	Tactical equipment shop	1,250
Total		15,850
Erlangen	Tactical equipment shop	9,840
	do	2,300
	Dining facility	1,750
Total		13,890
Friedberg	Barracks	2,100
Giessen	Consolidation of heating facility	1,300
Grafenwoehr	Decontamination site	1,650
	Squad/crew qualification range	4,500
	Platoon qualification range	7,500
	Squad/crew qualification range	2,650
Total		16,300
Hanau	Temperature controls	1,850
	Barracks	4,050
Total		5,900
Heidelberg	Energy monitoring and control system	1,150
Hohenfels	Storage and maintenance facility	1,150
Illesheim	Flight simulator building	7,300
Kaiserslautern	Barracks	12,200
	Heating plant	1,450
	Dining facility	2,650
Total		16,300
Kirchgoens	Tactical equipment shop	3,350
	Barracks with dining facility	10,400
Total		13,750
Kitzingen	Barracks	3,950
	Maintenance facility	6,300
	Tactical equipment shop	7,100
	Barracks	3,450
Total		20,800
Kriegsfeld	Barracks	3,650
Mainz	Barracks with dining facility	5,100
Schweinfurt	Facilities modernization	2,450
Various locations	Hardstand	5,300
	Temperature controls	1,300
Total		6,600
Vilseck	Fighting vehicle training facility	9,400
	Barracks	5,800
	Barracks	9,300
	Barracks	10,600
	Dining facility	3,600
	Battalion headquarters and classroom	3,000
Total		41,700
Wertheim	Barracks	7,600
	Tactical equipment shop	6,200
	Ammunition storage	2,150

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
	Barracks	2,050
Total		18,000
Wiesbaden AFB	General support maintenance shop	1,200
Wildflecken	Facility modernization	5,800
	Upgrade range 9	3,050
	Attic insulation	1,850
Total		10,700
Grand total, Germany		240,840
Turkey:		
Cakmakli	Unaccompanied officers quarters	2,300
Izmit	Barracks	1,450
Grand total, Turkey		3,750

¹ Obligation or expenditure of funds for these projects is limited by section 106 requirements regarding the master restationing plan (MRP). MRP is discussed under "Areas of Special Emphasis."

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Bad Kissingen	Automatic boiler plant	¹ \$1,650
Hanau	Parking area	² 3,300
Wertheim	Battalion headquarters and classroom	³ 2,300
Turkey	Gymnasium	³ 2,200
	Administration building	³ 1,100

¹ The committee deferred project to allow Army time to redesign for use of gas fired boilers.

² The committee directed non appropriated funds be used.

³ Deferred without prejudice.

U.S. ARMY WESTERN COMMAND

The commander of the U.S. Army Western Command (WEST-COM) commands and supports assigned and attached Active and Army Reserve units, installations, and activities in Hawaii and possessions and trust territories in the Pacific administered by the U.S.

The committee approved \$1,050,000 for one project at the following location:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Johnston Island	Expansion of maintenance building	\$1,050

RAPID DEPLOYMENT FORCE

Construction of the second phase of an Army base camp to accommodate approximately one-third of a division force in Egypt.

The committee approved \$53,000,000 for one project at the following location:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Ras Banas	Upgrade/construct RDF facilities	\$53,000

U.S. ARMY COMMUNICATION COMMAND

The U.S. Army Communications Command (USACC) has world-wide responsibilities for engineering, installing, operating, and maintaining the Army portion of the Defense Communications System and for providing, operating, and maintaining the Army's communications-electronics facilities.

The committee approved \$3,950,000 for one project at the following location in Germany:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Bad Aibling	Defense Communications System terminal	\$3,950

MINOR CONSTRUCTION

The minor construction section contains exigent and specified projects having a funded cost of \$1,000,000 or less, including construction, alteration, or conversion of permanent or temporary facilities. An amount of \$28,000,000 has been designated for unknown or exigent locations. The total request of \$30,000,000 was reduced to reflect \$2,000,000 of unused exigent authorization available from fiscal year 1982.

The committee approved \$24,750,000 for 44 projects at the following locations and the committee directed the use of \$2,800,000 for fiscal year 1981 specified minor authorization to cover part of this requirement. Thus, the new authorization for specified minor projects is \$21,950,000.

The total new authorization for minor construction is \$49,950,000.

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Fort Carson, Colo.....	Administration and supply building addition	¹ \$440
Fort Devens, Mass.....	Gymnasium addition	¹ 490
Fort Ord, Calif.....	Company administration and supply	¹ 550
Fort Stewart, Ga.....	Company administration and supply	¹ 580
	Warehouse	¹ 540
	Company administration and supply	¹ 520
Germany: Kriegsfeld.....	Administration building	¹ 880
Korea: Various locations.....	General purpose auditorium.....	¹ 630
	Gymnasium addition	¹ 300
	Revetments	¹ 750
Kwajalein	Missile assembly facility	² 750
	Explosive storage facility.....	² 660
Turkey.....	Multipurpose building	¹ 570

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
.....do		¹ 350

¹ The committee deferred without prejudice.

² The committee deferred without prejudice due to the uncertainty of the level of R. & D. authorization for the ballistic missile defense program.

DEFICIENCY AUTHORIZATION AND COST VARIATIONS

The committee did not approve deficiency authorization totaling \$15,820,000 for the Army in the fiscal years 1981 and 1982 Military Authorization Acts for which appropriations are being sought in the fiscal year 1983 military construction appropriations request. Favorable bids received make the increase unnecessary.

Deficiency authorization was not provided for two projects for which the committee directed prior authorization be utilized, since the increases can be approved under the cost variation procedures. These projects are:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location	Description	Prior authoriza- tion	Current estimate
Fort Ord.....	Troop medical clinic.....	\$4,700	\$5,800
Fort Huachuca.....	Electromagnetic test facility.....	4,650	4,950

FAMILY HOUSING

The Army presented an authorization request for appropriations for the Army Family Housing program as follows:

ARMY FAMILY HOUSING

[in thousands of dollars]

Category	Army request	Committee approved
Construction:		
New family housing (572 units requested).....	61,395	0
Consolidated community center.....	8,700	0
Post acquisition construction.....	109,680	43,800
Total construction.....	179,775	43,800
Operation and maintenance (143,962 units):		
Operating expenses.....	448,566	448,566
Maintenance.....	342,639	342,639
Total operation and maintenance.....	791,205	791,205
Leasing:		
Domestic (667 units).....	2,868	2,868
Foreign (18,573 units).....	76,602	76,602
Total leasing.....	79,470	79,470
Debt payment:		
Principal.....	38,534	38,534

ARMY FAMILY HOUSING—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Category	Army request	Committee approved
Debt payment—Con.		
Interest and other expenses.....	4,243	4,243
Servicemen's mortgage insurance premiums.....	407	407
Total debt payment.....	43,184	43,184
Homeowners assistance programs.....	4,000	4,000
Less anticipated reimbursements.....	-8,181	-8,181
Total Army family housing request.....	1,089,453	953,478

The Army Family Housing program authorization for appropriations request totaled \$1,089,453,000. This includes \$8,181,000 that has been applied to the program from anticipated reimbursements. The total request of \$1,089,453,000 compares with \$885,462,000 for fiscal year 1982 (without the supplemental request), an increase of \$203,991,000 primarily for construction, leasing, and operation and maintenance. (If the fiscal year 1982 supplemental request is included, the increase is \$169,285,000.)

NEW CONSTRUCTION

The committee deferred without prejudice \$58,095,000 for 542 units, primarily for junior non-commissioned officers, at the following five locations:

Location	Units	Cost (thousands)
Fort Irwin, Calif.....	114	\$10,454
Fort Lewis, Wash.....	115	9,962
Grafenwoehr, Germany.....	143	17,214
Hohenfels, Germany.....	13	1,565
Wildflecken, Germany.....	157	18,900

The Army advised the committee that the bids received for the 254 units to be constructed at Fort Irwin, CA, in 1982 were lower than anticipated due to an extremely favorable bidding climate. The committee, therefore, directed the Army to apply \$3,300,000 of the FY 1982 authorization toward the construction of 30 additional units at Fort Irwin as part of the 1982 program.

The committee also deferred without prejudice the request of \$8,700,000 for a consolidated community center facility to support the 2,600 unit family housing complex at Aliamanu Military Reservation, Hawaii.

POST ACQUISITION CONSTRUCTION

The committee approved \$43,800,000 for energy conservation investment projects on existing family housing units at installations inside the United States; installations in Panama, Puerto Rico, Japan, and Korea; and cities in Germany.

The committee deferred without prejudice \$65,880,000 for improvements to existing family housing units as follows:

	Cost (thousands)
Program:	
Regular improvements.....	\$60,880
Minor construction.....	5,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

The committee approved \$791,205,000 for operation and maintenance of the fiscal year 1983 estimated average inventory of 143,962 family housing units. Reimbursements are anticipated to be \$8,181,000.

LEASING

The committee is aware of the Army intention to terminate its domestic leasing program by the end of fiscal year 1983. The committee is also aware of the Army requirement to remedy its housing shortfalls in foreign countries through the foreign leasing program where it is most economical to do so.

The committee, therefore, approved the Army request to continue the 667 lease authorizations required for the domestic leasing program through FY 1983 to allow for an orderly termination of the program. The committee also approved the Army request to increase the total number of authorized leases for family housing units in foreign countries from 12,961 to 18,573 units. The Army stated that 12,961 leased unit allocations have been approved for execution and an additional requirement for 4,612 units has been validated. Thus, the request includes 17,573 units for known requirements and an added 1,000, or 6 percent of the known requirements, in order to provide the Secretary of the Army with the managerial flexibility to satisfy critical housing deficiencies which might arise subsequent to authorization.

SUMMARY OF ARMY PROGRAM CHANGES

	Thousands
Total Army authorization request	\$2,051,593
Military construction:	
Total Army authorization request.....	962,140
Committee reductions:	
Fitzsimons Army Medical Center, Colo.: Barracks.....	3,600
Fort Bragg, N.C.: Company administration and supply	2,050
Fort Carson, Colo.:	
Company administration and supply.....	440
Battalion headquarters and classroom.....	1,450
Company administration and supply.....	1,750
Fort Devens, Mass.: Gymnasium addition.....	490
Fort Hood, Tex.:	
Battalion headquarters and classroom.....	1,500
Company administration and supply.....	2,350

SUMMARY OF ARMY PROGRAM CHANGES—Continued

	Thousands
Military construction—Con.	
Committee reductions—Con.	
Fort Huachuca, Ariz.:	
Electromagnetic test facility (prior year authorization available).....	4,950
Child care center	2,600
Fort Irwin, Calif.:	
Company administration and supply.....	2,400
Modernize miscellaneous facilities.....	2,000
Outdoor courts and fields.....	2,250
Physical fitness center.....	5,500
Fort Leavenworth, Kans.:	
Gymnasium.....	3,400
Addition to Bell Hall	4,200
Unaccompanied officer quarters.....	23,000
Fort Ord, Calif.:	
Troop medical clinic (Prior year auth avail).....	5,800
Company administration and supply.....	550
Barracks.....	2,200
Fort Polk, La.:	
Company administration and supply.....	4,300
Battalion headquarters and classroom.....	2,450
Fort Rucker, Ala.:	
Barracks.....	11,700
Company administration and supply.....	2,100
Fort Stewart, Ga.:	
Company administration and supply.....	580
Warehouse	540
Company administration and supply.....	520
Barracks.....	5,800
Germany:	
Parking Area, Hanau	3,300
Battalion headquarters and classroom, Wertheim	2,300
Administration building, Kriegsfeld	880
Automatic boiler plant, Bad Kissingen	1,650
Iowa-AAP, Ia: Improve T-barricade at rail dock	600
Korea:	
Monobuoy system	3,350
Chapel and community activities center	1,100
Gymnasium with pool.....	2,350
Theater with stage	1,050
Gymnasium.....	2,600
General purpose auditorium	630
Gymnasium addition.....	300
Revetments	750
Kwajalein:	
Missile assembly facility	750
Explosive storage facility	660
Launch complex.....	21,600
Schofield Barracks, Hawaii: Barracks.....	17,800
Turkey:	
Gymnasium.....	2,200
Administration building.....	1,100
Multipurpose building	570
Multipurpose building	350
Worldwide:	
Minor construction-Exigent.....	2,000
Specified minor reduction	2,800
Yakima-Firing Center, Wash.: Gymnasium	1,700
Total.....	172,860
New Military construction authorization	789,280
Family housing:	
Total Army authorization request.....	1,089,453

	Thousands
Committee reductions:	
Fort Irwin, Calif.: 114 units.....	13,754
Fort Lewis, Wash. 115 units.....	9,962
Grafenwoehr, Germany: 143 units.....	17,214
Hohenfels, Germany: 13 units.....	1,565
Wildflecken, Germany: 157 units.....	18,900
Aliamanu, Hawaii: Consolidated Community Center.....	8,700
Improvements (including minor construction).....	65,880
Total reductions.....	- 135,975
New family housing authorization.....	953,478
New Army military construction and family housing authorization.....	\$1,742,758

TITLE II—NAVY

Under Title II of the bill, as amended, the Navy requested \$1,056,940,000 for major construction and \$61,068,000 for minor construction and \$791,285,000 for family housing for a total of \$1,909,293,000. After careful review and consideration of the Navy's request, the committee approved a program of \$1,613,161,000 as shown in the following tabulation:

	Navy request	Committee approved
Inside the United States.....	\$857,120,000	\$735,190,000
Outside the United States.....	199,820,000	155,820,000
Family housing.....	791,285,000	668,013,000
Minor construction.....	61,068,000	55,938,000
Total.....	1,909,293,000	1,614,961,000

MAJOR COMMAND SUMMARY

(In thousands of dollars)

Major command	Navy request	Committee approved
Inside the United States:		
Marine Corps.....	166,865	157,915
Office of Naval Research.....	1,800	1,800
Chief of Naval Operations.....	181,450	153,450
Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet.....	52,435	48,735
Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet.....	123,120	113,520
Chief of Naval Education and Training.....	40,550	14,350
Bureau of Medicine and Surgery.....	12,500	12,500
Naval Material Command.....	270,250	224,770
Naval Telecommunications Command.....	8,150	8,150
Total, inside the United States.....	857,120	735,190
Outside the United States:		
Marine Corps.....	3,350	3,350
Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet.....	10,200	4,000
Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet.....	131,030	97,780
Naval Forces Europe.....	35,150	30,600
Naval Telecommunications Command.....	5,650	5,650
Naval Security Group Command.....	9,390	9,390
Naval Material Command.....	2,050	2,050
Host nation infrastructure support.....	3,000	3,000
Total, outside the United States.....	199,820	155,820
Total.....	1,056,940	891,000
Minor construction.....	61,068	55,938
Grand Total.....	1,118,008	946,948

FACILITY CLASSES SUMMARY

[In thousands of dollars]

Description	Request			Committee approved		
	Navy	Marine Corps	Total	Navy	Marine Corps	Total
Operational.....	112,135	15,100	124,235	108,885	15,100	123,985
Training.....	64,800	7,800	72,600	24,300	6,300	30,600
Maintenance and production.....	86,920	41,450	128,370	85,720	41,450	127,170
R.D.T. & E.....	42,850	0	42,850	1,800	0	1,800
Supply.....	14,030	10,200	24,230	8,300	2,750	11,050
Medical.....	13,900	0	13,900	13,900	0	13,900
Administrative.....	23,630	0	23,630	3,730	0	3,730
Housing and community facs.....	82,990	75,165	158,155	70,890	75,165	146,055
Utilities.....	441,420	20,500	461,920	408,170	20,500	428,670
Real estate.....	4,050	0	4,050	4,050	0	4,050
Total.....	886,725	170,215	1,056,940	729,745	161,265	891,010
Minor construction.....			61,068			55,938
Specified.....			(40,068)			(34,938)
Exigent.....			(21,000)			(21,000)
Total and new obligational.....			1,118,008			946,948

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

The committee approved \$24,840,000 for 7 pollution abatement projects. The projects are listed with the appropriate command's projects or in the minor construction section.

ENERGY CONSERVATION

The committee approved \$31,260,000 for 33 energy conservation projects. The projects are listed with the appropriate command's projects or in the minor construction section.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH

The committee approved \$4,290,000 for 5 occupational safety and health projects. The projects are listed with the appropriate command's projects or in the minor construction section.

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

MARINE CORPS

The primary mission of the Marine Corps is to provide air and ground forces for the seizure and defense of advanced naval bases and the conduct of land operations incident to the prosecution of the naval campaign.

The committee approved \$157,915,000 for 28 projects at the following 10 locations:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
MCAS, Beaufort, SC.....	Maintenance hangar addition.....	\$4,650
MCB, Camp Lejeune, NC.....	Maintenance shop.....	2,400
	Engine battalion vehicle maintenance shop.....	2,850
	Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing.....	21,800
Total.....		27,050
MCB, Camp Pendleton, Calif.....	Telephone exchange building.....	1,750
	Armories.....	3,400
	Small arms range-outdoor.....	3,750
	Tactical vehicle maintenance shops.....	4,850
	Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing.....	9,715
	Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing (MWTC Bridgeport).....	10,500
Total.....		33,965
MCAS, Cherry Point, NC.....	Aircraft parking apron.....	3,800
	Operational Trainer Facility.....	2,550
	Maintenance Hangar.....	7,100
	Engine Maintenance Shop.....	3,100
	Avionics Shop.....	2,900
	Power Check Pads.....	2,000
	Maintenance Facilities.....	3,550
	Maintenance and Operations Facility.....	1,300
	Ground Support Equipment Shop.....	3,000
Total.....		29,300
MCAS El Toro, Calif.....	Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing modernization.....	7,200
MCAS Kaneohe Bay, Hawaii.....	Radar operational facility.....	1,450
MCRD, Parris Island, S.C.....	Enlisted dining facilities modernization.....	1,550
MC&EC, Quantico, Va.....	Cold storage warehouse.....	2,750
	Steam plant modifications.....	20,500
Total.....		23,250
MCRD, San Diego, Calif.....	Armory.....	2,700
	Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing.....	21,000
	Dining facility.....	3,400
Total.....		27,100
MCAS, Tustin, Calif.....	Ground Support Equipment Shop.....	2,400

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
MCB, Camp Lejeune, N.C.....	Applied instruction building improvements.....	¹ 1,500
MCAS, Cherry Point, N.C.....	Warehouses.....	¹ 2,500
MCAS, Tustin, Calif.....	do.....	¹ 4,950

¹ Deferred without prejudice.

OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH

The Office of Naval Research encourages, promotes, plans, initiates, and coordinates naval research as related to the maintenance of future naval power and the preservation of national security.

The committee approved one project:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
NRL, Washington, D.C.	Electronics laboratory	1,800

CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

Under the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Naval Operations exercises command over the certain central executive organizations, assigned shore activities, and the operating forces of the Navy.

The committee approved \$153,450,000 for 7 projects at the following 2 locations.

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
NA, Annapolis, Md.	Heating, ventilation, air-conditioning	3,200
	Vehicular bridge	2,500
	Total	5,700
NSSB, Kings Bay, Ga.	Dredging	14,800
	Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	3,600
	Enlisted dining facilities	3,900
	Land acquisition	750
	Utilities and site improvement	124,700
Total		147,750

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
NA, Annapolis, Md.	Physical education facilities modernization	¹ 11,200
NSA, San Francisco, Calif.	Child care center	¹ 1,400
CNDW, District of Columbia	Public works facility	¹ 1,200
	Administrative office modernization	¹ 14,200
Total		15,400

¹ Deferred without prejudice.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, ATLANTIC FLEET

The Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet exercises operational, organizational, planning, logistic and administrative command over, surface, submarine and fleet marine forces and supporting shore installations.

The committee approved \$48,735,000 for 10 projects at the following 7 locations.

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
NAS, Cecil Field, Fla.....	Aircraft maintenance facilities.....	2,500
	Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing.....	6,800
Total.....		9,300
NS Charleston, S.C.....	Degaussing pier.....	4,000
	Mooring platform.....	6,700
Total.....		10,700
NAB, Little Creek, Va.....	Dredging.....	1,850
NS, Mayport, Fla.....	Operational trainer facilities.....	9,000
	Utilities system expansion.....	6,800
Total.....		15,800
NSB, New London, Conn.....	Waterfront facilities improvement and land acquisition.....	5,900
AFHSA, Norfolk, Va.....	Intelligence building addition.....	2,085
COSA, Norfolk, Va.....	Readiness training facility.....	3,100

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
NS, Charleston, S.C.....	Child care center.....	¹ 1,550
NAS, Norfolk, Va.....	Applied instruction building.....	¹ 2,150

¹ Deferred without prejudice.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, PACIFIC FLEET

The Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet exercises operational, organizational, planning, logistic and administrative command over air, surface, submarine and fleet marine forces and supporting shore installations.

The committee approved \$113,520,000 for 14 projects at the following nine locations:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
NF, Adak, Alaska.....	Security improvements.....	\$1,900
NAS, Alameda, Calif.....	Solid waste disposal system.....	1,900
NAS, Lemoore, Calif.....	Operational trainer facility.....	5,600
	Airframes shop.....	3,400
Total.....		9,000
NAS, Moffett Field, Calif.....	Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing.....	6,850
NAS, North Island, Calif.....	Maintenance hanger.....	19,000
	Aircraft intermediate maintenance facility.....	3,870
	Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing.....	8,200
Total.....		31,070
NS, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii.....	Electronics/communications maintenance shop.....	1,900
	Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing and land acquisition.....	12,500

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Total.....		14,400
SIMA, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii.....	Intermediate maintenance facility.....	7,000
NS, San Diego, Calif.....	Dry dock mooring.....	24,000
	Land acquisition.....	3,300
Total.....		27,300
SIMA, San Diego, Calif.....	Intermediate maintenance facility.....	14,100

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
NAS, Alameda, Calif.....	Child care center.....	¹ \$1,750
NAS, Lemoore, Calif.....	Pay and personnel support office.....	¹ 1,700
NAS, Moffett Field, Calif.....	Applied instruction building.....	¹ 4,950
NAS Whidbey Island, Wash.....	Child care center.....	¹ 1,200

¹ Deferred without prejudice.

NAVAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING COMMAND

The Chief of Naval Education and Training is responsible for the education and training of all naval personnel.

The committee approved \$14,350,000 for 8 projects at the following six locations:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
NAS, Corpus Christi, Tex.....	Aircraft ready fuel storage.....	\$1,150
	Radar air traffic control center.....	1,650
Total.....		2,800
FCTCA, Dam Neck, Va.....	Enlisted dining facility addition.....	1,700
NTC, Great Lakes, Ill.....	Facility energy improvements.....	1,850
NE&TC, Newport, R.I.....	Facility energy improvements.....	1,100
NTC, Orlando, Fla.....	Heating, ventilation, air-conditioning.....	2,700
	Utilities improvements.....	2,800
Total.....		5,500
NAS, Pensacola, Fla.....	Facility energy improvements.....	1,400

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
NAS, Memphis, Tenn.....	Applied instruction building.....	¹ \$8,400
FTC, Norfolk, Va.....	Applied instruction buildings.....	¹ 5,400
NAS, Pensacola, Fla.....	Training management complex.....	¹ 4,000
NTTC, Pensacola, Fla.....	Applied instruction building.....	¹ 4,450
FASWTCP, San Diego, Calif.....	do.....	¹ 3,950

¹ Deferred without prejudice.

BUREAU OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY

The Bureau of Medicine and Surgery safeguards and promotes the health of Navy and Marine Corps personnel, their dependents, and other personnel.

The committee approved \$12,500,000 for two projects at the following two locations.

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
NRMC, Camp Lejeune, N.C.	Support facilities	\$2,800
NRMC, Oakland, Calif.	Medical and dental clinic (Mare Island NSY, Vallejo)	9,700

NAVAL MATERIAL COMMAND

The Naval Material Command is the single integrated material support agency for the Navy. Its mission includes the development, procurement and support of total weapons systems, depot maintenance, supply management and facilities support.

The committee approved \$224,770,000 for 15 projects at the following 13 locations.

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
NARF, Alameda, Calif.	Facility energy improvements	\$1,400
NWS, Charleston, S.C.	Steam plant	1,140
NARF, Cherry Point, N.C.	Support equipment shop	5,550
NPWC, Great Lakes, Ill.	Heating, ventilation, air-conditioning	3,400
Portsmouth NSY, Kittery, Maine	Electrical/electronics shop modernization	2,200
NPWC, Norfolk, Va.	Facility energy improvements	2,330
	Utilities improvements	4,600
	Air emission control	9,100
Total		16,030
NARF, North Island, Calif.	Manufacture/repair shop	18,500
ASO, Philadelphia, Pa.	Heating, ventilation, air-conditioning	1,400
Norfolk NSY, Portsmouth, Va.	Steam plant	160,000
NPWC, San Francisco, Calif.	Sewerage system	9,800
Mare Island NSY, Vallejo, Calif.	Breathing air system safety improvements	2,250
NADC, Warminster, Pa.	Combined structural/aircraft fire/rescue station	1,400
NSWC, White Oak, Md.	Sewerage system	1,700

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
NSWC, White Oak, Md.	Shipboard environmental simulation facility	\$4,000
NWC, China Lake, Calif.	Engineering laboratory	\$8,700
NSWC, Dahlgren, Va.	Applied research laboratory	\$10,800
NUSC, Newport, R.I.	Launcher laboratory	\$6,500

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
NSWSES, Port Hueneme, Calif.....	Guided missile laboratory.....	≈ 7,800
NSC, San Diego, Calif.....	General warehouse.....	≈ 4,430
NMEF, Yorktown, Va.....	Mine engineering laboratory.....	≈ 3,250

¹ Ships to be used for testing in lieu of this facility.

² Deferred without prejudice.

NAVAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

The Naval Telecommunications Command provides communications by satellite and radio for administrative functions and command and control of Navy ships.

The committee approved \$8,150,000 for three projects at the following two locations:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
NCAMSEP, Honolulu, Hawaii.....	Satellite communications building addition.....	\$1,800
	Standby generator plant.....	4,500
Total.....		6,300
NCAMSA, Norfolk, Va.....	Seawalls (NRTF, Annapolis, Md.).....	1,850

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

MARINE CORPS

For the Marine Corps outside the United States, the committee approved \$3,350,000 for two projects at the following two locations.

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
MCAS, Iwakuni, Japan.....	Engine maintenance shop.....	\$1,350
MCB Camp Smedley D. Butler, Okinawa, Japan.....	Aircraft rinse facility.....	2,000

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, ATLANTIC FLEET

For the Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet, outside the United States, the committee approved \$4,000,000 for two projects at the following two locations:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
NF, Keflavik, Iceland.....	Security improvements.....	\$1,400
Do.....	Fuel facilities (1st incr).....	2,600

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
NS, Keflavik, Iceland.....	Chapel and religious education building	¹ \$4,700
	Family services center	¹ 1,500
Total.....		6,200

¹ Deferred without prejudice.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, PACIFIC FLEET

For the Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet, outside the United States, the committee approved \$97,780,000 for seven projects at five locations:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
NAF, Atsugi, Japan	Steam and condensate systems	\$1,700
NAS, Cubi Point, Republic of the Philippines...	Engine maintenance shop addition	1,300
	Jet engine test cell	5,000
	Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing.....	4,100
Total.....		10,400
NSF, Diego Garcia, Indian Ocean.....	Facilities expansion	47,380
NA, Kenya.....	do	8,300
NA, Somalia.....	do	30,000

The committee did not authorize a portion of the following project:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
NSF, Diego Garcia, Indian Ocean.....	Facilities expansion	¹ \$33,250

¹ A portion of the project was deferred without prejudice.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, NAVAL FORCES EUROPE

The Commander in Chief, Naval Forces Europe, commands the Naval component of the unified U.S. European Command.

The committee approved \$30,600,000 for two projects at the following location:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
NAS, Sigonella, Italy	Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing and dining facility	\$15,800
	Utilities upgrade and expansion and land acquisition.....	14,800
Total.....		30,600

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
FOCCE, London, United Kingdom.....	Fleet Command Center	¹ \$3,250
NAS, Sigonella, Italy	Cold storage warehouse	² 1,300

¹ Deleted by the committee—seek NATO funding.

² Deferred without prejudice.

CHIEF OF NAVAL MATERIAL

For the Chief of Naval Material, outside the United States, the committee approved \$2,050,000 for a project at the following location:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
NPWC, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines.	Facility energy improvements.....	\$2,050

NAVAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

For the Naval Telecommunications Command, outside the United States, the committee approved \$5,650,000 for three projects at the following three locations:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
NCAMS Western Pacific, Guam.....	Standby generator plant.....	\$1,750
NCAMS Mediterranean, Naples, Italy	Communication terminal (NAS Sigonella)	2,500
NCS, Thurso, Scotland	Medical dental facility.....	1,400

NAVAL SECURITY GROUP COMMAND

For the Naval Security Group Command, outside the United States, the committee approved \$9,390,000 for four projects:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
NSGA, Edzell, Scotland	Operations building addition.....	\$3,600
	Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing addition	3,600
	Enlisted dining facility.....	1,140
	Fire protection water system	1,050
Total.....		9,390

HOST NATION INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT

For the Host Nation Infrastructure Support, the committee approved \$3,000,000 at various locations.

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Various locations.....	Host nation infrastructure support	\$3,000

MINOR CONSTRUCTION

The committee approved \$21,000,000 for exigent minor construction and \$34,938,000 for 65 minor construction projects for a total of \$55,938,000.

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
NWS Charleston, S.C.	Pay and personnel support office.....	¹ \$250
	Family services center	¹ 390
NSGA Chesapeake, Va	Chapel and religious education building	¹ 930
NAVCAMSEASTPAC Honolulu, Hawaii	Chapel	¹ 950
NS Mayport, Fla	Family services center	¹ 650
NAS Moffett Field, Calif.....	Family services center	¹ 400
NAS Sigonella, Italy	Family services center	¹ 990
MCAS Beaufort, S.C.....	Gymnasium addition.....	¹ 570

¹ Deferred without prejudice.

NAVY FAMILY HOUSING PROGRAM

The Navy presented an authorization request for appropriation for the Family Housing program as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Request	Committee changes	Revised total
Construction of new family housing (1,749 units)	83,513	—83,513	0
Land acquisition (91 acres)	1,000	0	1,000
Post acquisition construction (includes energy conservation investments, \$7,574)	47,333	—39,759	7,574
Total authorization for appropriation request, construction.....	131,846	—123,272	8,574
Operation and maintenance	612,329	0	612,329
Operating expenses	297,750	0	297,750
Maintenance	314,579	0	314,579
Leasing	21,480	0	21,480
Domestic	1,492	0	1,492
Foreign	19,988	0	19,988
Debt payment	32,793	0	32,793
Principal	28,007	0	28,007
Interest and other expenses	4,023	0	4,023
Servicemen's mortgage insurance premiums for existing coverage.....	763	0	763
Total authorization request O. & M. and debt payment	798,448	0	798,448
Less: Anticipated reimbursements	—7,163	0	—7,163
Total authorization for appropriation request, O. & M. and debt payment	791,285	—123,272	668,013

The Navy Family Housing program authorization for appropriations request totalled \$791,295,000. In addition, \$7,163,000 will be applied to the program from resources recouped from prior year authorized programs and anticipated reimbursements. The total of the \$791,295,000 request compares with \$607,605,000 for fiscal year 1982 an increase of \$183,680,000 primarily for operations and maintenance. The Committee approved a total of \$668,013,000. All new family housing construction in the amount of \$83,513,000 and non-energy related family housing improvements in the amount of \$39,759,000 were deferred without prejudice.

NEW CONSTRUCTION

The committee approved the acquisition of land in support of housing as indicated below:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
NS Mayport, Fla	91 acres, land acquisition.....	\$1,000

The committee deleted the construction or acquisition of 1,749 units of family housing at the following locations:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
MCB Camp Pendleton, Calif.....	104 units.....	\$9,112
MCMWTC Bridgeport, Calif.....	77 units.....	10,908
NS Long Beach, Calif.....	368 units.....	33,090
NATC Patuxent River, Md.....	1,000 units of Wherry housing to be acquired.....	5,000
NS Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.....	200 units.....	25,403
Total.....		83,513

IMPROVEMENT OF EXISTING QUARTERS

Section 204(f) of the bill disapproves the improvement of existing family housing at an amount of \$39,759,000 and approved \$7,574,000 to be expended only for energy conservation projects.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

In section 602(a)(2) the committee authorized the appropriation of funds for family housing construction in the amount of \$8,574,000 and for operations, leasing, maintenance, and debt payment in the amount of \$659,439,000 for a total of \$668,013,000.

SUMMARY OF NAVY PROGRAM ACTION

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Inside the United States:		
Marine Corps:		
MCB, Camp Lejeune, N.C.....	Applied instruction building improvements.....	—\$1,500

SUMMARY OF NAVY PROGRAM ACTION—Continued

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Inside the United States—Con.		
Marine Corps.—Con.		
MCAS, Cherry Point, N.C.	Warehouses	—2,500
MCAS, Tustin, Calif.	Warehouse	—4,950
Subtotal		—8,950
Chief of Naval Operations:		
NA, Annapolis, Md.	Physical education facilities modernization	—11,200
NSA, San Francisco, Calif.	Child care center	—1,400
CNDW, District of Columbia	Public works facility	—1,200
	Administrative office modernization	—14,200
Subtotal		—28,000
Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet:		
NS Charleston, S.C.	Child care center	—1,550
NAS, Norfolk, VA	Applied instruction, building	—2,150
Subtotal		—3,700
Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet:		
NAS, Alameda, Calif.	Child care center	—1,750
NAS, Lemoore, Calif.	Pay and personnel support office	—1,700
NAS, Moffett Field, Calif.	Applied instruction building	—4,950
NAS Whidbey Island, Wash.	Child care center	—1,200
Subtotal		—9,600
Naval Education and Training Command:		
NAS, Memphis, Tenn.	Applied instruction building	—8,400
FTC, Norfolk, Va.	Applied instruction buildings	—5,400
NAS, Pensacola, Fla.	Training management complex	—4,000
NTTC, Pensacola, Fla.	Applied instruction building	—4,450
FASWTCP, San Diego, Calif.	do	—3,950
Subtotal		—26,200
Naval Material Command:		
NSWC, White Oak, Md.	Shipboard environmental simulation facility	—4,000
NWC, China Lake, Calif.	Engineering laboratory	—8,700
NSWC, Dahlgren, Va.	Applied research laboratory	—10,800
NUSC, Newport, R.I.	Launcher laboratory	—6,500
NSWSES, Port Hueneme, Calif.	Guided missile laboratory	—7,800
NSC, San Diego, Calif.	General warehouse	—4,430
NMEF, Yorktown, Va.	Mine engineering laboratory	—3,250
Subtotal		—45,480
Outside the United States:		
Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet:		
NS, Keflavik, Iceland	Chapel and religious education building	—4,700
	Family services center	—1,500
Subtotal		—6,200
Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet:		
NSF, Diego Garcia, Indian Ocean	Facilities expansion	—33,250
Commander in Chief, Naval Forces Europe:		
FOCCE, London, United Kingdom	Fleet Command Center	—3,250
NAS, Sigonella, Italy	Cold storage warehouse	—1,300
Subtotal		—4,550
Family housing:		
Construction of new Family housing:		
MCB Camp Pendleton, Calif.	164 units	—9,112
MCMWTC Bridgeport, Calif.	77 units	—10,908

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
NS Long Beach, Calif	368 units	-33,090
NATC Potuxent River, Md.	1000 units of Wherry housing to be acquired	-5,000
NS Guantanamo Bay, Cuba	200 units	-25,403
Subtotal		-83,513
Post acquisition construction		-39,759
Subtotal		-123,372
Minor construction:		
NWS Charleston, S.C.	Pay and personnel support office	-250
	Family services center	-390
NSGA Chesapeake, Va.	Chapel and religious education building	-930
NAVCAMSEASTPAC Honolulu, Hawaii	Chapel	-950
NS Mayport, Fla.	Family services center	-650
NAS Moffett Field, Calif.	do.	-400
NAS Sigonella, Italy	do.	-990
MCAS Beaufort S.C.	Gymnasium addition	-570
Subtotal		-5,130
Total		-294,332

Section 205 allows the Navy to use for military family housing purposes seven housing units comprising a portion of the United States Public Health Service Facility, Norfolk, Virginia. Section 987 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (Public Law 97-35) required in part that the Secretary of Health and Human Services provide for the closure, transfer, or self-sufficiency of all hospitals and other stations of the Public Health Service not later than September 30, 1982. The Navy had a requirement for the Norfolk Public Health Service Facility to augment its health care delivery system in the Norfolk, Virginia area and, under the provisions of PL 97-35, the Secretary of Health and Human Services will transfer this facility to the Department of the Navy at no cost on September 30, 1982.

The property consists of 21 acres and improvements, including seven sets of quarters. The Family Housing Survey of January 31, 1981 for the Norfolk area shows a current deficit of 1,326 family housing units for all eligible military personnel. The projected deficit through fiscal year 1986 is for 3,659 family housing units. Because of the shortage of family housing in the Norfolk area, the committee feels that the seven housing units at the Public Health Service facility should continue to be used for Navy family housing.

Although the economics as well as the need support the Navy's decision to use these units for family housing, Title 42 U.S.C. 1594i prohibits the Navy from acquiring additional family housing units unless authorized in an annual Military Construction Authorization Act. The committee believes this prohibition was not intended to apply to special situations like the Public Health Service Facility no cost transfer, but rather to normal acquisitions by purchase or the like. Yet the prohibition in 42 U.S.C. 1594i does not raise questions of technical legal authority to use these assets for family housing purposes. The proposed legislation would eliminate any such technical question.

AIR COMBAT MANEUVERING RANGE

The Air Combat Maneuvering Range ("ACMR") is a pilot training device which provides real time aircraft flight information (i.e. location, air speed, altitude, acceleration, etc.) to a ground station for each aircraft operating on the range. Use of the ACMR for training by Air Force and Navy fighter squadrons has greatly enhanced the realism and safety of pilot training.

The ACMR facility located near Cape Hatteras, North Carolina, is not sufficient to accommodate all of the current training needs of the Navy and Marine Corps. The committee is concerned that an additional ACMR facility may be needed on the east coast to provide the most cost-effective use of the limited flight hours accorded the Navy/Marine Corps tactical squadrons and to accommodate the additional demands on the ACMR which will result from the introduction of F/A-18 aircraft into the Atlantic fleet in 1984. The Naval Air Station, Key West, Florida, has for many years been the principal Naval training site for air intercept and air combat training because of its consistently good weather and availability of military air space. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to review the feasibility and cost associated with the installation of an ACMR facility in the approximate area of the Naval Air Station, Key West, Florida, and to report its findings to the committee no later than December 1, 1982.

TITLE III—AIR FORCE

The Air Force request under Title III of the bill amounted to \$2,867,682,000. The committee, after careful review and consideration of the Air Force request, approved the following programs:

	Air Force request	Committee approved
Military construction:		
Inside the United States	\$1,080,002,000	\$810,250,000
Outside the United States	696,404,000	520,998,000
Minor construction	104,691,000	90,974,000
Total military construction	1,881,097,000	1,422,222,000
Military family housing:		
Family housing construction	177,050,000	17,000,000
Family housing support	809,535,000	809,535,000
Total family housing	986,585,000	826,535,000
Grand total title III—Air Force	2,867,682,000	2,248,757,000

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

MAJOR COMMAND SUMMARY

(In thousands of dollars)

Major command	Air Force request	Committee approved
Inside the United States:		
Air Force Logistics Command	\$74,381	\$51,781
Air Force Systems Command	73,750	48,700
Air Training Command	98,830	86,580
Alaskan Air Command	58,230	58,230
Military Airlift Command	64,230	52,880
National Military Command Center	3,300	3,300
North American Air Defense Command	1,900	1,900
Pacific Air Forces	0	0
Strategic Air Command	393,069	381,369
Tactical Air Command	92,022	78,270
U.S. Air Force Academy	6,050	0
M-X	207,000	40,000
Air National Guard	4,540	4,540
Air Force Reserves	2,700	2,700
Total, inside the United States	1,080,002	810,250
Outside the United States:		
Military Airlift Command	62,970	7,270
Pacific Air Forces	161,220	129,220
Strategic Air Command	2,440	2,440
Tactical Air Command	48,600	24,600
U.S. Air Forces in Europe	421,174	357,468
Total, outside the United States	696,404	520,998

MAJOR COMMAND SUMMARY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Major command	Air Force request	Committee approved
Outside the United States—Con.		
Minor construction.....	104,691	90,974
Total military construction.....	1,881,097	1,422,222
Total family housing.....	986,585	826,535
Grand total title III—Air Force.....	2,867,682	2,248,757

FACILITY CLASS SUMMARY

[In thousands of dollars]

Category	Air Force request	Committee approved
Operational.....	\$909,832	\$596,532
Training.....	31,800	28,800
Maintenance/production.....	96,290	92,290
R.D.T. & E.....	126,700	73,700
Supply.....	41,550	24,700
Medical.....	100,100	96,600
Administrative.....	47,401	40,351
Personnel housing/community support.....	178,506	136,750
Personnel housing.....	(129,600)	(127,300)
Community support.....	(48,906)	(9,450)
Utilities.....	171,675	171,675
Pollution abatement.....	16,200	16,200
Air.....	(1,300)	(1,300)
Water.....	(14,900)	(14,900)
Energy.....	47,960	46,360
Real estate.....	8,392	7,290
Minor construction.....	104,691	90,974
Subtotal.....	1,881,097	1,422,272
Military family housing.....	986,585	826,535
Total.....	2,867,682	2,248,757

MINOR CONSTRUCTION

Minor construction projects in the regular Military Construction program totaling \$72,974,000, although at known locations, will be tabulated and discussed under the heading of minor construction throughout this report. Additionally, \$18,000,000 is provided for exigent minor construction at undetermined locations.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

The committee approved \$16,200,000 for pollution abatement projects. The projects are listed with the appropriate command's projects.

DEFICIENCY AUTHORIZATION

The committee approved a \$42 million increase in fiscal year 1977 Military Construction Authorization for the Air Force. This increase is for the completion of the Aeropropulsion System Test Facility (ASTF) at Arnold Engineering Development Center, Ten-

nessee The Air Force has also requested \$42 million in additional appropriations for ASTF in the fiscal year 1983 Appropriation Bill.

ENERGY CONSERVATION INVESTMENT PROGRAM

The committee approved \$57,920,000 for energy conservation projects. The projects are listed with the appropriate command's projects or in the minor construction section.

AIR FORCE LOGISTICS COMMAND

The mission of the Air Force Logistics Command (AFLC) is to provide an adequate and efficient system of procurement, production, surveillance, maintenance and supply for the U.S. Air Force and train specialized units for accomplishment of logistics functions in overseas areas and theaters.

The committee approved \$51,781,000 for 10 projects at the following locations:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Hill AFB, Utah	Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	\$3,950
	Emergency back-up power	1,895
Total		5,845
Kelly AFB, Tex.	Logistics systems operations center	8,500
	Alter industrial waste treatment plant	1,500
Total		10,000
McClellan AFB, Calif	Integration support facility	9,000
Robins AFB, Ga.	Jet fuel storage	4,700
Tinker AFB, Okla	OSH-Alter aircraft depot maintenance hangers	8,700
	Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	1,950
Total		10,650
Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio	Air freight terminal	9,500
	Alter FTD computer facility	2,086
Total		\$11,586

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Kelly AFB, Tex.	Education center	¹ \$2,000
Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio	Materials laboratory	¹ 20,600

¹ Deferred without prejudice.

AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND

The mission of the Air Force Systems Command (AFSC) is to advance aerospace technology, adapt it into operational aerospace systems, and acquire qualitatively superior aerospace systems and material needed to accomplish the Air Force mission.

The committee approved \$48,700,000 for 12 projects at the following locations:

Installation	Project	Cost (thousands)
Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tenn...	Energy conservation investment program.....	\$6,600
Cape Canaveral AFS, Fla.....	Alter various STS facilities.....	9,100
Edwards AFB, Calif.....	Security police operations facility.....	1,550
	Flight test support complex.....	3,600
	Munitions area upgrade.....	1,950
Total.....		7,100
Eglin AFB, Fla.....	Aircraft general purpose shop (Aux 9).....	3,000
	Aircraft operational facilities.....	3,500
	Add to heavy equipment shop.....	1,050
	Photo optics maintenance facility.....	2,850
Total.....		10,400
Fort MacArthur, Calif.....	Alter unaccompanied officer personnel housing.....	\$1,900
Moffett Naval Air Station, Calif.....	Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing.....	1,900
Sunnyvale AFS, Calif.....	Add to and alter satellite control facility.....	11,700

The committee reduced the following project by the amount shown:

Installation	Project	Cost (thousands)
Cape Canaveral AFS, Fla.....	Alter various STS facilities.....	\$6,600

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Installation	Project	Cost (thousands)
Edwards AFB, Calif.....	Modify satellite propulsion research facility.....	¹ \$5,000
Eglin AFB, Fla.....	Add to and alter recreation center.....	² 1,200
	Energy conservation investment program.....	³ 1,600
Laurence G. Hanscom AFB, Mass.....	Systems management engineering facility (phase II).....	² 9,100
	Library and education center.....	³ 1,550

¹ Committee deferred project due to problems with design.

² Deferred without prejudice.

³ Committee deferred. Project not cost effective.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

The mission of the Air Training Command (ATC) is to provide flying training leading to an aeronautical rating, aircrew training, basic and advanced technical training leading to an Air Force specialty, basic military training, mobile training, and other training as may be directed by the U.S. Air Force Chief of Staff.

The committee approved \$86,580,000 for 18 projects at the following locations:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Chanute AFB, Ill	Energy conservation investment program.....	\$8,160
Columbus AFB, Miss.....	Centralized aircraft support system.....	1,150
Goodfellow AFB, Tex.....	Cryptologic systems maintenance training facility.....	4,300
	Special intelligence training facility.....	3,600
	Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing.....	7,400
Total.....		15,300
Keesler AFB, Miss.....	OSH—Fire suppression system.....	1,500
	Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing.....	7,500
Total.....		9,000
Lackland AFB, Texas	Clinical investigation facility.....	6,100
Laughlin AFB, Texas.....	Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	2,850
	Energy conservation investment program.....	2,920
Total.....		5,770
Lowry AFB, Colo.....	Technical training facility.....	11,300
	Data processing facility.....	1,750
Total.....		13,050
Maxwell AFB, Ala	Readiness training facility	7,300
	Energy conservation investment program.....	7,850
Total.....		15,150
Randolph AFB, Tex	Approach lighting system.....	1,050
Reese AFB, Tex	Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing.....	3,750
Sheppard AFB, Tex	Visiting officer quarters	5,500
Williams AFB, Ariz.....	Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing.....	2,600

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Chanute AFB, Ill	Gymnasium	¹ \$3,300
Randolph AFB, Tex	Alter administrative facilities.....	¹ 2,850
Williams AFB, Ariz.....	Logistic complex	¹ 6,100

¹ Deferred without prejudice.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

The Alaskan Air Command (AAC) provides combat ready forces, defense weapons systems, aircraft control and warning elements, and air defense forces within Alaska for employment under the operational control of command, Alaska NORAD/CONAD region. It also provides logistical support for the Strategic Air Command, the Military Airlift Command, the Command of the Alaskan Sea Frontier and the United States Army.

The committee approved \$58,230,000 for 6 projects at the following locations:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Eielson AFB, Alaska	Support equipment shop	\$5,100
	Add to and alter data processing facility	1,480
Total		6,580
Elmendorf AFB, Alaska	Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	4,800
Galena Airport, Alaska	Petroleum operations facility	2,050
Shemya AFB, Alaska	Aircraft instrument landing system	1,200
Various locations	Minimally attended radar (MAR) (Phase II)	43,600

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

(INSIDE THE UNITED STATES)

The mission of the Military Airlift Command (MAC) is to maintain the military airlift system in the constant state of readiness necessary for performance of all airlift tasks and emergency operations assigned by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. MAC supervises and operates the Air Weather Service, the Air Rescue and Recovery Service, Aeromedical Evacuation System and Military Airlift.

The committee approved \$52,880,000 for 16 projects at the following locations:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Altus AFB, Okla	Add to and alter data processing facility	\$1,060
Andrews AFB, Md	Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	6,100
	Energy conservation investment program	6,050
Total		12,150
Charleston AFB, S.C.	Data processing facility	1,550
Dover AFB, Del	Alter heat plant	2,500
Kirtland AFB, N. Mex.	Energy conservation investment program	3,570

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Little Rock AFB, Ark.....	Corrosion control facility	3,000
	Upgrade sewage treatment plant	2,500
Total.....		5,500
McGuire AFB, N.J.....	Hydrant fueling system	8,000
	Upgrade aircraft maintenance facilities	8,000
Total.....		16,000
Norton AFB, Calif.....	Alter jet fuel storage	1,300
Pope AFB, N.C.....	Upgrade overruns.....	2,000
	Data processing facility.....	1,400
	Land fee purchase	1,000
Total.....		4,400
Scott AFB, Ill.....	Vehicle maintenance complex.....	3,450
	Upgrade composite medical facility	1,400
Total.....		4,850

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Andrews AFB, Md.....	Add to child care center	¹ \$1,050
Bolling AFB, District of Columbia	Administration facility	¹ 4,200
McChord AFB, Wash.....	Gymnasium	¹ 3,700
Travis AFB, Calif.....	Chapel center	¹ 2,400

¹ Deferred without prejudice.

NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND CENTER

The mission of the National Military Command Center (NMCC) is to provide command and control activities in direct support of the decision making processes of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the National Command Authorities.

The committee approved \$3,300,000 for one project at the following location:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Pentagon Building, Va	National military command center power upgrade	\$3,300

NORTH AMERICAN AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND

The primary mission of the North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD) is to provide tactical warning and attack as-

assessment to the National Command Authorities in the event of an attack on the United States or Canada.

The committee approved \$1,900,000 for one project at the following location:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
NORAD Cheyenne Mountain Complex, Colo.....	Addition to fire protection system.....	\$1,900

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

(INSIDE THE UNITED STATES)

The mission of the Strategic Air Command (SAC) is to organize, train, equip, administer, prepare and maintain a bomber, tanker and missile force in a state of readiness capable of conducting intensive and conclusive worldwide offensive operations against enemies of the United States.

The committee approved \$381,369,000 for 37 projects at the following locations:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Beale AFB, Calif.....	Satellite communications ground term.....	\$1,250
	Data processing facility.....	1,345
Total.....		2,595
Blytheville AFB, Ariz.....	Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing.....	1,350
Carswell AFB, Tex.....	Add to composite medical facility.....	49,500
	Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing.....	5,000
Total.....		54,500
Dyess AFB, Tex.....	Add to and alter dining hall.....	1,650
Ellsworth AFB, S. Dak.....	Jet fuel storage.....	1,350
F.E. Warren AFB, Wyo.....	Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing.....	4,150
Fairchild AFB, Wash.....	Tanker alert facility.....	2,000
	Control tower.....	1,740
Total.....		3,740
Griffiss AFB, N.Y.....	Heat plant.....	49,050
K.I. Sawyer AFB, Ind.....	Aircraft organizational maintenance shop.....	1,600
	Upgrade sewage treatment plant.....	2,850
Total.....		4,450
Loring AFB, Maine.....	Energy conservation investment program.....	1,220
	Alter heat plant.....	33,700
	Advanced waste treatment facility.....	3,500

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Total.....		38,420
Malmstrom AFB, Mont.....	Heat plant.....	49,900
March AFB, Calif.....	Data processing facility.....	1,550
McConnell AFB, Kans.....	Dining hall.....	3,000
Offutt AFB, Nebr.....	Satellite communications ground terminal.....	3,300
	Jet fuel storage.....	1,350
	Energy conservation investment program.....	2,800
	Emergency power circuit.....	2,000
	Add to communications facility.....	3,805
Total.....		13,255
Peterson AFB, Colo.....	Consol space operations center (Phase I).....	67,700
Powell AFB, Wyo.....	STRC—Land acquisition, utilities and site improvements.....	1,250
Vandenberg AFB, Calif.....	Security police operations facility.....	2,559
	Vehicle maintenance shop.....	1,300
	Range safety processing center.....	6,200
	STS facility modifications.....	14,800
	STS vertical assembly enviro-shelter.....	40,000
	Hypergolic stockpile storage.....	4,900
	Data processing facility.....	1,550
	Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing.....	4,100
	Visiting officer quarters.....	4,350
Total.....		79,759
Various locations.....	Support facilities for mobile ground terminals.....	1,900
Wurtsmith AFB, Mich.....	Waste treatment facility.....	1,800

The committee reduced the following project by the amount shown:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Vandenberg AFB, Calif.....	STS facility modifications.....	\$11,700

The committee notes with interest that the Air Force's Military Construction Program for fiscal year 1984 contains a Pre-Launch Survivability (PLS) project for an alert-dedicated runway and alert facility at Loring AFB, Limestone, Maine. The committee supports this project and strongly urges the Air Force to retain it in its fiscal year 1984 program.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

(INSIDE THE UNITED STATES)

The mission of the Tactical Air Command (TAC) is to organize, equip, train, administer and operate the assigned or attached forces

and participate in prompt and sustained tactical air operations and strategic defense of the continental United States.

The committee approved \$78,270,000 for 30 projects at the following locations:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Bergstrom AFB, Tex	Squadron operations.....	\$1,250
	Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing.....	4,200
Total.....		5,450
Cannon AFB, N. Mex	Energy conservation investment program.....	1,800
Davis-Monthan AFB, Ariz	Airfield pavements	1,600
	OSH-aircraft corrosion control facility	1,850
	Small aircraft maintenance dock.....	3,850
	Water supply storage and distribution system	4,650
Total.....		11,950
George AFB, Calif	Data processing facility.....	1,400
Holloman AFB, N. Mex	Data Processing facility	1,300
	Water wells.....	1,500
Total.....		2,800
Homestead AFB, Fla	Data processing facility.....	1,500
Langley AFB, Va	Addition to aircraft apron	4,750
	Squadron operations	1,050
	Vehicle maintenance complex.....	5,200
	Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing.....	4,550
Total.....		15,550
MacDill AFB, Fla.....	Data processing facility.....	1,400
Moody AFB, Ga.....	Small aircraft maintenance dock.....	2,550
Mountain Home AFB, Idaho	Aircraft maintenance unit facility.....	1,700
Nellis AFB, Nev	Addition to aircraft apron	5,900
	Various operations/maintenance facilities	3,350
	Squadron operations facility	1,900
	Tactical range support	2,300
	Vehicle maintenance shop.....	1,900
	Add to water system	4,550
Total.....		19,900
Seymour-Johnson AFB, N.C.....	Various aircraft maintenance facilities	1,400
	Energy conservation investment program.....	2,220
Total.....		3,620
Shaw AFB, S.C.....	Data processing facility.....	1,150
Tyndall AFB, Fla	Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	3,550
	Regional sewer connection	2,750
Total.....		6,300
Various locations—Maine	OTH-B radar support facilities and land acquisition	1,200

The committee reduced the following project by the amount shown:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Various locations—Maine.....	OTH-B radar support facilities and land acquisition	\$6,000

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Mountain Home AFB, N. Mex.....	Land acquisition (fee purchase).....	¹ \$1,102
Gila Bend Aux Field, Ariz.....	Gymnasium	² 1,700
MacDill AFB, Fla.....	RDF/REDCOM base support.....	² 2,300
Mountain Home AFB, Idaho.....	Add to gymnasium.....	² 2,650

¹ Committee deleted because requirement not firm.

² Deferred without prejudice.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The mission of the United States Air Force Academy is to educate and train young men and women to become officers in the United States Air Force.

The Air Force requested, but the committee did not approve the following projects:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
USAF Academy, Colo	Airmanship training facilities.....	¹ \$3,000
	Visitors' center.....	² 3,050

¹ Deferred without prejudice.

² Deferred without prejudice. Committee recommends examining construction with NAF funds.

MX PROGRAM

The purpose of the MX Weapon System is to provide a highly capable land based missile force that will maintain deterrence and stability in the post-1980s time frame. MX will provide the quantity and quality of ICBM weapons for effective retaliatory target coverage against an expended Soviet target base and will alleviate the growing asymmetry between Soviet and U.S. ICBM capability.

The committee approved \$40,000,000 for MX projects at various locations:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Various locations.....	MX maintenance and test facilities.....	\$40,000

The committee reduced the MX authorization request by the following amounts in consonance with previous action by the committee to disapprove interim silo basing:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Various locations.....	MX facilities.....	\$167,000
	Maintenance facilities.....	- 10,845
	Basing facilities.....	- 150,546
	Training facilities.....	- 5,609

AIR NATIONAL GUARD

The Federal mission of the Air National Guard is to provide units with trained personnel and sufficient and suitable equipment, capable and ready for mobilization in time of war or national emergency to support the Air Force.

The committee approved \$4,540,000 for three projects at the following locations:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Buckley ANGB, Colo	Satellite communications ground terminal.....	\$1,100
Otis ANGB, Mass.....	Satellite communications ground terminal.....	1,100
	Air installation compatible use zones.....	2,340
Total.....		3,440

AIR FORCE RESERVE

The mission of the Air Force Reserve is to develop, maintain and provide the active Air Force with those operationally ready units and trained individuals needed to augment the active force in time of war or national emergency.

The committee approved \$2,700,000 for one project at the following location:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Westover AFRB, Mass	Air installation compatible use zones	\$2,700

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

(OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES)

The mission of the Military Airlift Command (MAC) is to maintain the military airlift system in the constant state of readiness necessary for performance of all airlift task and emergency operations assigned by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. MAC supervises and operates the Air Weather Service, the Air Rescue and Recovery Service, Aeromedical Evacuation system, and Military Airlift.

The committee approved \$7,270,000 for three projects at the following location:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Rhein Main AB, Germany	Add to and alter fuel systems maintenance dock	\$2,200
	Vehicle maintenance complex	1,900
	Energy conservation investment program	3,170
Total		7,270

The committee did not authorize the following project:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Lajes Field, Azores	Upgrade/construct RDF facilities	¹ \$55,700

¹ The committee determined that the uncertainty of future base rights in Portugal precluded approving this project at this time.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

(OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES)

The mission of the Pacific Air Forces is to conduct, control and coordinate offensive and defensive air operations. The forces provide administrative and logistical support for Air Force units in the Pacific geographical area.

The committee approved \$129,220,000 for 24 projects at the following locations:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Clark AB, Philippines	Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing.....	\$3,350
	Upgrade powerplant (phase II)	11,030
Total.....		14,380
Camp Long, Korea	Power/data upgrade for special operations facility.....	1,750
Diego Garcia, Indian Ocean.....	Upgrade/construct RDF facilities	4,550
Kadena AB, Japan.....	Aircraft corrosion control facility.....	6,100
	Jet fuel storage (phase III)	8,000
	Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing.....	1,850
Total.....		15,950
Kunsan AB, Korea.....	Airfield pavements	2,900
	Operating jet fuel storage.....	2,050
	Alter aircraft shelters.....	15,290
	Alter/construct unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	10,500
	Unaccompanied officer personnel housing	3,250
	Airmen dining hall.....	2,500
Total.....		36,490
Kwang/Ju AB, Korea	Ground fuel storage	2,450
Misawa AB, Japan.....	Fire station	1,650
	Security police operations facility.....	1,300
	Add to and alter electronic security operations facility.....	3,650
Total.....		6,600
Osan AB, Korea	Aircraft shelters and pavements	7,000
	Aircraft maintenance and operations facilities.....	2,700
	Composite medical facility.....	20,500
	Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	10,500
	Unaccompanied officer personnel housing.....	3,300
Total.....		44,000
San Miguel Naval Station, Philippines.....	PACBAR Radar Support Facilities	1,750
Yaedake Communications Station, Japan	Upgrade power plant.....	1,300

The committee reduced the following project by the amount shown:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Diego Garcia, Indian Ocean.....	Upgrade/construct RDF facilities	\$32,000

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND (OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES)

The mission of the Strategic Air Command (SAC) is to organize, train, equip, administer, prepare and maintain a bomber, tanker and missile force in a state of readiness capable of conducting intensive and conclusive worldwide offensive operations against enemies of the United States.

The committee approved \$2,440,000 for one project at the following:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Andersen AFB, Guam.....	Munitions maintenance/storage facilities.....	\$2,440

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND (OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES)

The mission of the Tactical Air Command (TAC) is to organize, equip, train, administer and operate the assigned or attached forces and participate in prompt and sustained tactical air operations and strategic defense of the United States.

The committee approved \$24,600,000 for two projects at the following locations:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Keflavik NAS, Iceland	Data processing facility.....	\$3,600
Various locations, worldwide.....	Contingency facilities	21,000

The committee reduced the following project by the amount shown:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Various locations, worldwide.....	Contingency facilities	\$24,000

U.S. AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

The mission of the U.S. Air Forces in Europe (USAFE) is to conduct, control and coordinate offensive and defensive air operations in accordance with tasks assigned by the Commander-in-Chief U.S. European Command. It also fulfills responsibilities assigned by the Joint Chiefs of Staff in areas not included in either the NATO or U.S. Commander-in-Chief Europe area or responsibility.

The committee approved \$357,468,000 for 30 projects at the following locations:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
RAF Alconbury, United Kingdom	Medical/dental clinic.....	\$19,100
Aviano AB, Italy.....	Vehicle maintenance complex.....	2,800
	Add to and alter electrical distribution system	4,400
Total.....		7,200
RAF Bentwaters, United Kingdom.....	Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing.....	1,250
Bitburg AB, Germany.....	Data processing facility.....	1,800
RAF Fairford, United Kingdom	Fire station	2,700
	Aircraft instrument landing system	1,200
	Visiting officer quarters	4,900
Total.....		8,800
Hahn AB, Germany.....	Data processing facility.....	1,800
Incirlik AB, Turkey	Transmitter/receiver facility	6,000
	Add to and alter data processing facility	1,290
Total.....		7,290
RAF Lakenheath, United Kingdom.....	Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing.....	1,100
RAF Mildenhall, United Kingdom.....	Aircraft support facilities.....	6,700
	Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing.....	3,750
	Visiting officer quarters	2,700
Total.....		13,150
Ramstein AB, Germany.....	Security police operations facility.....	1,348
	Sound suppressor support	1,300
Total.....		2,648
Ras Banas, Egypt	Upgrade/construct RDF facilities	125,600
Sembach AB, Germany.....	Aircraft engine maintenance facility.....	2,950
Spangdahlem AB, Germany.....	Data processing facility.....	1,820
Torrejon AB, Spain.....	Sound suppressor support	1,100
	Refueling vehicle complex.....	1,200
	Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing.....	1,700
Total.....		4,000
RAF Upper Heyford, United Kingdom.....	Aircraft support facilities.....	6,700
	Add to and alter fire station.....	1,100
Total.....		7,810
Various locations—Oman	Upgrade/construct RDF facilities	60,350
Various locations.....	GLCM support facilities	85,400
	Special operations facility	2,630
Total.....		88,030
RAF Woodbridge	Fuel systems maintenance dock.....	1,750
Zweibruecken AB, Germany.....	Alter data processing facility	1,020

¹ None of these funds may be expended for the construction of any commissary or exchange facility.

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
RAF Bentwaters, United Kingdom.....	Gymnasium	¹ \$3,250
RAF Fairford, United Kingdom	Recreation center	¹ 1,100
	Add to and alter gymnasium	¹ 1,100
RAF Lakenheath, United Kingdom.....	Gymnasium	¹ 3,250
	Child care center.....	¹ 1,450
Geilenkirchen Nato Base, Germany.....	Community support facilities.....	² 5,206
Landstuhl, Germany.....	Aeromedical staging facility	² 3,500
Sembach AB, Germany.....	Warehouse	¹ 3,050
RAF Upper Heyford.....	Child care center.....	¹ 1,500
Various locations.....	Minimum essential facilities.....	² 28,600
Various locations.....	Hardened logistics facilities.....	² 4,000
Various locations.....	WRM storage facilities.....	² 7,700

¹ Deferred without prejudice.

² Deferred without prejudice. Project should be built with non-appropriated funds.

³ Committee previously directed this requirement to be met by Army in major upgrade of this hospital.

⁴ NATO has agreed to fund this requirement. \$32M has been allocated by NATO for next year.

⁵ Committee recommends Air Force seek NATO funding.

MINOR CONSTRUCTION

The minor construction section contains exigent and specified projects having a funded cost of \$1,000,000 or less, including construction, alteration, or conversion of permanent or temporary facilities.

The committee approved \$72,974,000 for 124 projects and \$18,000,000 for exigent minor construction.

The committee did not authorize the following:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Brooks AFB, Tex.....	Add to chapel center	¹ \$400
Edwards AFB, Calif.....	Education center	¹ 820
Eglin AFB, Fla.....	Add to explosive processing laboratory	¹ 340
Fort MacArthur, Calif.....	Convert to chapel.....	¹ 510
Little Rock AFB, Ark.....	Add to and alter child care center.....	¹ 570
Scott AFB, Ill.....	Alter headquarters facility.....	¹ 400
Griffiss AFB, N.Y.....	Command and control simulation laboratory	¹ 900
March AFB, Calif.....	Alter division headquarters.....	¹ 550
Minot AFB, N. Dak.....	Add to and alter gymnasium	¹ 710
Pease AFB, N.H.....	Add to and alter gymnasium	¹ 290
	Child care center.....	¹ 1,000
Powell, Wyo.....	STRC—consolidated base exchange and commissary	² 290
	STRC—recreation facilities	¹ 1,000
Whiteman AFB, Mo.....	Convert to group headquarters.....	¹ 457
	Add to child care center	¹ 540
Langley AFB, Va.....	Child care center.....	¹ 550
USAF Academy, Colo.....	Alter community support center.....	¹ 600
Lajes AB, Portugal.....	Add to and alter data processing	² 790
Osan AB, Korea.....	Publications management center.....	¹ 650
	Child care center.....	¹ 510
Taegu AB, Korea.....	Avionics/supply administrative.....	¹ 510
RAF Bentwaters, United Kingdom.....	Warehouse	¹ 310
Bitburg AB, Germany.....	Convert to warehouse	¹ 510
RAF Fairford, United Kingdom	Arts and crafts center	¹ 510

¹ Deferred without prejudice.

² Build with non-appropriated funds.

³ Committee deferred until base rights agreement has been finalized.

FISCAL YEAR 1982 SUPPLEMENTAL

The committee deferred, without prejudice, the following project requested in the Air Force fiscal year 1982 Supplemental:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
MacDill AFB, Fla.....	RDF/REDCOM base support.....	\$17,000

AIR FORCE FAMILY HOUSING

The goal of the Air Force Family Housing Account under this Act is to provide adequate, well maintained family quarters for all 350,000 family members either in government owned and leased buildings, or in the adjacent private community through the use of housing referral services. Pursuit of this goal requires payment of fixed costs for management, services, utilities, furnishings, maintenance, and debt payment for an average of 142,000 government owned units, 350 domestic leases, and 6,000 foreign leases.

[In thousands of dollars]

	Request	Committee changes	Revised total
Construction	\$177,050	—\$160,050	\$17,000
New houses (946 units)	100,550	—100,550	0
Post acquisition	76,500	—59,500	17,000
Support	809,535	NC	809,535
Operations and maintenance	697,848	NC	697,848
Operations	340,911	NC	340,911
Maintenance	356,937	NC	356,937
Leasing	53,723	NC	53,723
Domestic	2,300	NC	2,300
Foreign	51,423	NC	51,423
Debt payment	64,114	NC	64,114
Less anticipated reimbursements	—6,150	NC	—6,150
Total Air Force family housing request	986,585	—160,050	826,535

FAMILY HOUSING NEW CONSTRUCTION

The \$100,550,000 request covered 946 units at six locations. It was intended to offset a portion of the worldwide 20,000 unit deficit of housing where the private community does not provide sufficient numbers of adequate housing units to support the Air Force mission.

Location	Project units	Thousands
Fort MacArthur, Calif	200	\$20,000
MacDill AFB, Fla	26	3,200
Powell, Wyoming	50	3,850
Incirlik, Turkey	200	20,000
RAF Bentwaters, United Kingdom	300	35,000
Greenham Common, United Kingdom	170	18,500

The committee deferred, with prejudice, all of the above projects.

POST ACQUISITION CONSTRUCTION

The Air Force request of \$76,500,000 covers 70 projects at various locations. These funds were intended to counter obsolescence of the aging inventory and provide modern facilities comparable with private sector housing which is consistent with retention goals.

The committee deferred, without prejudice, all of the improvements program except \$17,000,000 for energy conservation investment improvements.

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

The committee approved \$697,848,000 for operation and maintenance of the fiscal year 1983 estimated average inventory of 142,083 family housing units. Reimbursements are anticipated to be \$6,150,000.

LEASING

The committee approved \$2,300,000 for the domestic program to allow for the orderly termination of the program.

The committee approved \$51,423,000 for the foreign leasing program to include 8,028 units, seven of which may exceed the statutory maximum of \$1,400 per month.

DEBT PAYMENT

The committee approved \$64,114,000 for principal and interest payments on mortgaged Capehart and Wherry housing units and Servicemen's Mortgage Insurance premiums.

SUMMARY OF AIR FORCE PROGRAM ACTION

A summary of actions taken on title III request of the Air Force is tabulated by project as follows:

Installation and project	Thousands
Total of request (Title III)	\$2,867,682
Air Force Logistics Command:	
Kelly AFB, Tex., Education Center	-2,000
Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio, Materials laboratory	-20,600
Air Force Systems Command:	
Edwards AFB, Calif., Modify Satellite Propulsion Research Facility	-5,000
Eglin AFB, Fla., add to and alter recreation center	-1,200
Eglin AFB, Fla., energy conservation investment program	-1,600
Laurence G. Hanscom AFB, Mass., systems management engineering facility (Phase II)	-9,100
Laurence G. Hanscom AFB, Mass., library and education center	-1,550
Cape Canaveral, Fla., alter various space transportation systems	-6,600
Air Training Command:	
Chanute AFB, Ill., gymnasium	-3,300
Randolph AFB, Tex., alter administrative facilities	-2,850
Williams AFB, Ariz., logistics complex	-6,100
Military Airlift Command:	
Andrews AFB, Md., addition to child care center	-1,050
Bolling AFB, D.C., administrative facilities	-4,200
McChord AFB, Wash., gymnasium	-3,700
Travis AFB, Calif., chapel center	-2,400
Strategic Air Command:	

Installation and project		Thousands
Vandenberg AFB, Calif., space transportation system facility modifications.....		-11,700
Tactical Air Command:		
Gila Bend AF Aux Field, Ariz., gymnasium		-1,700
Holloman AFB, N. Mex., land acquisition (fee purchase)		-1,102
MacDill AFB, Fla., RDF/REDCOM base support		-2,300
Mountain Home AFB, Idaho, add to gymnasium.....		-2,650
Various locations—Maine, OTH-B radar support facilities and land acquisition.....		-6,000
United States Air Force Academy:		
Airmanship training facilities.....		-3,000
Visitors center.....		-3,050
M-X, Various locations:		
Maintenance facilities.....		-10,845
Basing facilities.....		-150,546
Training facilities.....		-5,609
Military Airlift Command (overseas):		
Lajes Field, Azores, Portugal, upgrade/Construct RDF facilities		-55,700
Pacific Air Forces (overseas):		
Diego Garcia AB, Indian Ocean, upgrade /Construct RDF facilities		-32,000
Tactical Air Command (overseas):		
Various locations, contingency facilities.....		-24,000
United States Air Forces in Europe:		
Gielenkirchen AB, Germany, community support facilities		-5,206
Landstuhl, Germany, add to and alter aeromedical staging facility		-3,500
Sembach AB, Germany, warehouse		-3,050
RAF Bentwaters, United Kingdom, gymnasium		-3,250
RAF Fairford, United Kingdom, recreation center		-1,100
RAF Fairford, United Kingdom, addition to gymnasium.....		-1,100
RAF Lakenheath, United Kingdom, gymnasium.....		-3,250
RAF Lakenheath, United Kingdom, child care center		-1,450
RAF Upper Heyford, United Kingdom, child care center		-1,500
Various locations, minimum essential facilities		-28,600
Various locations, hardened logistics facilities		-4,000
Various locations, WRM storage facilities.....		-7,700

Installation	Project	Thousands
Specified Minor Construction:		
Brooks AFB, Tex.....	Add to chapel center	-\$400
Edwards AFB, Calif.....	Education center	-820
Eglin AFB, Fla.....	Add to explosive processing laboratory	-340
Fort MacArthur, Calif.....	Convert to chapel.....	-510
Little Rock AFB, Ark.....	Add to and alter child care center.....	-570
Scott AFB, Ill.....	Alter headquarters facility.....	-400
Griffiss AFB, N.Y.....	Command and control simulation laboratory	-900
March AFB, Calif.....	Alter division headquarters	-550
Minot AFB, N.Dak.....	Add to and alter gymnasium	-710
Pease AFB, N.H.....	Add to and alter gymnasium	-290
	Child care center.....	-1,000
Powell, Wyo.....	STRC—Consolidated base exchange and commissary	-290
	STRC—Recreation facilities	-1,000
Whiteman AFB, Mo.....	Convert to group headquarters.....	-457
	Add to child care center	-540
Langley AFB, Va.....	Child care center.....	-550
USAF Academy, Colo.....	Alter community support center	-600
Lajes AB, Portugal.....	Add to and alter data processing.....	-790
Osan AB, Korea.....	Publications management center.....	-650
	Child care center.....	-510
Taegu AB, Korea.....	Avionics/supply administrative.....	-510
RAF Bentwaters, United Kingdom.....	Warehouse	-310
Bitburg AB, Germany	Convert to warehouse	-510
RAF Fairford, United Kingdom	Arts and crafts center	-510

Installation and project	Thousands
Military family housing, new construction:	
Fort MacArthur, Calif., 200 units	—\$20,000
MacDill AFB, Fla., 26 units	— 3,200
Powell, Wyo., 50 units	— 3,850
Incirlik AB, Turkey, 200 units	—20,000
RAF Bentwaters, United Kingdom, 300 units	—35,000
RAF Greenham Common, United Kingdom, 170 units	—18,500
Military family housing, improvements, lump sum	—59,500
Net change to title III	—618,925
New authorization title III	2,248,757
Fiscal year 1982 supplemental request:	
MacDill AFB, Fla.: RDF headquarters and support facilities	—17,000

LAND CONVEYANCE, FLORIDA

The committee has approved a provision that authorizes the Secretary of the Air Force to adjust the base boundaries at Eglin AFB, Florida to resolve encroachments by both the Air Force and private property owners resulting from inaccurate surveys.

FOREIGN MILITARY SALES CENTER FACILITY

WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB, OHIO

The committee approved a provision that would authorize the Air Force to use \$395,000 of Foreign Military Sales funds to alter a facility at Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio, for use as a Foreign Military Sales Center. The facility currently used is a condemned 30-year-old structurally unsound building that is a serious hazard to life and property.

TITLE IV DEFENSE AGENCIES

	Requested	Committee approved
Inside the United States.....	\$140,041,000	\$125,241,000
Outside the United States	203,574,000	94,457,000
Minor construction	13,460,000	9,620,000
Secretary of Defense contingency.....	30,000,000	5,200,000
Family housing construction.....	1,042,000	33,000
Family housing support.....	17,279,000	17,279,000
Total.....	405,936,000	251,830,000

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM

The Secretary of Defense's request, including minor construction, was \$405,936,000. Contained in this total was \$344,155,000 for major construction of new facilities and rehabilitation of existing facilities for the Defense Agencies at 6 locations within the United States and at 19 locations overseas, \$30 million for emergency construction authorization for the Secretary of Defense to provide for unforeseen construction requirements in emergency situations, \$13,460,000 for minor construction projects, \$1,042,000 for family housing construction and \$17,279,000 for family housing support.

The committee gave careful consideration to all projects. The following table summarizes the authorization requested and approved:

	Requested	Committee approved
Defense Logistics Agency.....	\$80,700,000	\$72,900,000
Defense Mapping Agency.....	24,141,000	24,141,000
National Security Agency.....	84,057,000	84,057,000
Secretary of Defense activities.....	154,717,000	38,600,000
Defense Foreign Language Institute.....	(31,000,000)	(23,500,000)
Defense Systems Management College.....	(4,600,000)	0
U.S. European Command.....	(13,000)	(13,000)
Defense installations, Mariana Islands.....	(35,000)	0
Classified activities.....	(12,100,000)	(2,100,000)
Department of Defense dependents schools.....	(64,200,000)	0
OSD emergency construction.....	30,000,000	5,200,000
Minor construction.....	13,460,000	9,620,000
Specified locations.....	(9,460,000)	(5,620,000)
Exigent.....	(4,000,000)	(4,000,000)
Family housing.....	18,321,000	17,312,000
New construction.....	(1,042,000)	(33,000)
Support.....	(17,279,000)	(17,279,000)
Total.....	405,396,000	251,830,000

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY

The mission of the Defense Logistics Agency is to provide services and supplies used in common by all of the Military Services. The Agency provides support in the areas of supply, contract administration, technical services, and property disposal to the Military Services, Federal Agencies and certain foreign governments.

The committee approved two projects at the following two locations:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Defense Fuel Support Point, Andersen Air Force Base, Guam.	JP-4 fuel storage tanks	\$43,900
Various locations, Korea.....	Fuel storage tankage	29,000

DEFENSE MAPPING AGENCY

The mission of the Defense Mapping Agency is to acquire or develop and to supply maps, charts, and other geodetic information required by the Department of Defense.

The committee approved \$24,141,000 for one project at the following location:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Aerospace Center, St. Louis, Mo.....	Addition to Cartographic and Geophysical Building	\$24,141

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

The mission of the National Security Agency is to organize, and manage activities and facilities for the production of foreign intelligence information.

The committee approved three projects at the following locations:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Fort George G. Meade, Md	Operations building	\$75,500
Classified location	Project LANCER.....	1,057
Classified location	Project MINISUB	7,500

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

The Secretary of Defense is provided \$38,600,000 for a communication project at Fort Belvoir, Virginia, for barracks facilities to support the Defense Foreign Language Institute, and for a war headquarters facility for the U.S. European Command.

The committee approved the following projects:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Ft. Belvoir, Va.....	Addition and alteration to communications and storage facilities	\$2,100
Defense Foreign Language Institute, Monterey, Calif.....	Barracks	23,500
Classified location	EUCOM War Headquarters	13,000

The committee did not approve the following projects:

Location	Project	Cost (thousands)
Defense Property Disposal Office, Anchorage, Alaska.....	Covered storage	¹ \$2,700
Defense Personnel support Center, Kaiserslautern, Germany.....	Cold storage expansion	¹ 5,100
Defense Systems Management College, Fort Belvoir, Va.....	Auditorium	¹ 4,600
Defense installations, Mariana Islands	Land acquisition	² 35,000
Defense Foreign Language Institute, Monterey, Calif.....	General instruction facility	¹ 7,500
Office of Dependents Schools, Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.....	Elementary school addition.....	¹ 510
Bamberg, Germany	Elementary school addition.....	¹ 1,730
	High school addition	¹ 1,740
Hanau, Germany	Elementary school addition.....	¹ 510
Kaiserslautern, Germany.....	Elementary school annex.....	¹ 7,967
Karlsruhe, Germany.....	Elementary and high school addition.....	¹ 7,380
Ludwigsburg, Germany	Middle school addition	¹ 910
Mainz, Germany.....	Elementary school addition.....	¹ 2,830
Nellingen, Germany.....	Elementary school addition.....	¹ 950
Nuernberg, Germany	High school addition	¹ 2,820
Ramstein Air Base, Germany.....	High school addition	¹ 1,460
Wuerzburg, Germany	Elementary school addition.....	¹ 3,920
Zweibruecken Air Base, Germany	High school addition	¹ 1,780
Comiso, Italy.....	Elementary and high school	¹ 15,280
Yokota, Japan.....	High school addition and renovation.....	¹ 5,660
Seoul, Korea	Elementary and high school addition.....	¹ 960
Greenham Common Royal Air Force Station, United Kingdom.....	Elementary and high school	¹ 15,250
Woodbridge Royal Air Force Station, United Kingdom.....	Elementary school addition.....	¹ 1,200

¹ Dis. red without prejudice.

² F.vious authority to be extended.

EMERGENCY CONSTRUCTION

The Secretary of Defense is provided \$5,200,000 of the \$30,000,000 requested in new authorization for unforeseen emergency construction requirements which he considers vital to the security of the United States. The committee approved the \$5,200,000 program giving consideration to the current \$24,800,000 balance of unused authorization.

MINOR CONSTRUCTION

The committee approved \$9,620,000 for minor construction projects authorized under 10 U.S.C. 2674. This includes \$5,620,000 for

known requirements and \$4,000,000 for unforeseen requirements which historically arise during the year and which should not be delayed for the normal budget process.

FAMILY HOUSING

The committee approved the \$17,312,000 requested for Military Family Housing to support the Defense Agencies. The details of this amount are as follows:

	<i>Thousands</i>
Improvement to existing family housing.....	\$33
Operations	2,246
Leasing	14,366
Maintenance.....	946
Subtotal	17,558
Less receipts.....	279
Operations and maintenance subtotal.....	17,279
Total family housing authorization	17,312

TITLE V—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION INFRASTRUCTURE

NATO AUTHORIZATION

The Secretary of Defense requested \$375,000,000 under this title for the U.S. contribution to the NATO Infrastructure Program in fiscal year 1983. This amount is based upon the increased rate of authorization of infrastructure projects by the NATO Payments and Progress Committee in recent years and in anticipation of an increase by NATO in its overall fund ceiling for the current five-year cost-sharing period (1980-1984).

It is essential to the United States that NATO fund our high priority facility construction requirements in Europe to the maximum extent possible and that we continue to meet our obligations to pay our share of this vital program. The committee supports the Department of Defense's fiscal year 1983 request.

TITLE VI—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The authorization of appropriations and administrative provisions contained in Title VI are designed to provide certain restrictions as well as relief in execution of the authorization contained in the act. With relatively few exceptions they are essentially the same as those recurring provisions contained in past years in each military construction authorization act.

WAIVER OF RESTRICTIONS

Section 601 is the same as language contained in prior acts and has the effect of authorizing the Secretaries of the Military Departments to proceed with construction authorized free of certain limitation in existing law pertaining to advance of public monies and acquisition of land. The first of these limitations (31 U.S.C. 529) would restrict the advance payment of money for services. However, in some instances in connection with military construction it may, for example, become necessary to construct and pay for utility lines and connections before utility services are obtained. The second limitation (10 U.S.C. 4774 and 9774) restricts construction until a detailed estimate is submitted to the Congress and specific appropriations made therefor. The third limitation, section 355 of Revised Statutes as amended (40 U.S.C. 255) provides that no money shall be expended for military construction until a written opinion of the Attorney General with respect to the validity of the title is obtained.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 602 is language which appears in each annual military construction act and corresponds to the equivalent section in prior acts, except the dollar amounts are changed to the amounts of authorizations contained in the titles of the Act and the addition of the amounts for family housing construction and support in the individual titles for the Military Departments and Defense Agencies. The amount for family housing construction includes construction or acquisition of family housing, including minor construction, improvements to public quarters, and relocation of family housing. The amount for family housing support includes operating expenses, leasing, maintenance of real property, payments of principal and interest on mortgage debts incurred, payment to the Commodity Credit Corporation, and mortgage insurance premiums authorized under section 222 of the National Housing Act. It authorizes the appropriation of funds to carry out the functions authorized by separate titles of the Act.

Subsection (b) is similar to subsection 605(b) in last year's Act and would authorize additional appropriations as a result of pay increases authorized pursuant to other law.

COST VARIATIONS

Section 603 contains general provisions which serve the dual purpose of providing a limited degree of flexibility to the Department of Defense and military services for exceeding the authorized cost of a project, when such increases could not reasonably have been anticipated, and also established specific limits on the use of this flexibility to meet unforeseen circumstances. Briefly, subsection (a) restricts the total costs of all projects for the military departments in a given title to the total amount authorized for that title except for variations in NATO. Subsection (b) is similar to section 703(b) in last year's Act. This section primarily authorizes, at the discretion of the Secretary of the military department or Director of the defense agency concerned, increases in the amounts specified in titles I, II, III, and IV without limitation provided that it is determined that such increase (1) is required for the sole purpose of meeting unusual variations in cost arising in connection with the project, and (2) could not have been reasonably anticipated at the time such project was submitted to the Congress. Subsection (c) is similar to section 703(d) in the last year's Act. Since the amount of the NATO request is not based upon specific project fund requirements but rather on the best estimate of what the U.S. obligation will be during the budget year, it is necessary to provide flexibility for necessary program adjustments. The cost variation will allow for a title increase of up to 25 percent at the discretion of the Secretary of Defense which will provide this flexibility. A written report to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives is required for variations in excess of 25 percent, and either (1) fifteen days has elapsed from the date of submission or (2) both committees have indicated approval of the increase before the Secretary may proceed with construction or acquisition. Subsection (d) is similar to section 703(f) in last year's Act. It provides that no project, the cost of which exceeds the statutory limit for minor construction, may be contracted for it if the scope has been reduced by more than 25 percent or if the current working estimate, based upon bids received, exceeds 25 percent, until a written notice of the facts concerning the reduced scope or increased cost has been submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives and either 15 days has elapsed or the committees have both indicated their approval. Subsection (e) is similar to section 703(g) in last year's Act and provides for annual reports to Congress.

CONSTRUCTION SUPERVISION

Section 604 is identical to section 704 in last year's Act. This section has the effect of directing that construction executed under this Act (1) be done by the Army Corps of Engineers or the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, or such other department or Government agency as the Secretary of Defense approves to assure efficient, expeditious and cost-effective accomplishment; (2) that the

Secretaries of the military departments report annually to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives a breakdown of the dollar value of contracts completed by the construction agencies, together with the design, construction supervision, and overhead fees charges by such agencies; (3) that all contracts (except for architect and engineering contracts which, unless otherwise authorized, shall continue to be awarded in accordance with presently established procedures, customs and practice) be awarded insofar as practicable on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder; and (4) the Secretaries of the military department report annually to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder. Additionally it provides that the reports shall show the ten architect-engineer firms which in terms of total dollars were awarded the most business and a listing of the contracts for each firm.

EFFECTIVE DATE FOR PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS

Section 605 makes the provisions of titles I, II, III, IV, and V effective October 1, 1982.

TITLE VII—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

	Requested	Committee approved
Army National Guard.....	\$33,000,000	\$33,000,000
Army Reserve.....	28,500,000	28,500,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve.....	21,900,000	21,900,000
Air National Guard.....	89,800,000	89,800,000
Air Force Reserve.....	29,000,000	29,000,000
Total.....	202,200,000	202,200,000

The budget request for construction in support of the Guard and Reserve components was \$202,200,000. The committee approved the request without change. The committee expects the Navy to fund the construction of the replacement facility authorized by section 916, PL 97-99 from funds authorized by this title.

The following summary represents the status of lump sum authorization provided continuously since the Guard and Reserve Forces facilities program reverted to this method of authorization in 1963:

RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES—ESTIMATED STATUS OF LUMP SUM AUTHORIZATION AS OF MAR. 1, 1982

[In thousands of dollars]

	Army		Naval and Marine Corps Reserve	Air Force		Total
	National Guard	Reserve		National Guard	Reserve	
1. Lump sum authorization (cumulative fiscal years 1963-82).....	530,710	458,057	304,410	541,023	180,098	2,014,298
2. Estimate of authorization to be committed through fiscal year 1982.....	515,743	450,625	296,431	538,241	175,798	1,976,838
3. Uncommitted balance ..	14,967	7,432	7,979	2,782	4,300	37,460
4. Added by present bill	33,000	28,500	21,900	89,800	29,000	202,200
5. Total available, fiscal year 1983.....	47,967	35,932	29,879	92,582	33,300	239,660
6. Estimated commitments in fiscal year 1983.....	43,292	35,932	27,315	91,300	29,000	226,839
7. Estimated residual authorization, end fiscal year 1983.....	4,675	0	2,564	1,282	4,300	12,821

TITLE VIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

The general provisions contained in Title VIII are either nonrecurring provisions or provisions that would amend previous statutes and which are designed to improve management and efficient use of construction resources.

LAND CONVEYANCE, HOUSTON COUNTY, GA.

Section 801 authorizes the Secretary of the Air Force to convey to the City of Warner Robins, Georgia, and the Board of Commissioners of Houston County, Ga., approximately 70 acres of land and improvements at Robins Air Force Base, Ga., in exchange for 400 acres of land owned by the city and the county that is adjacent to the base. The exchange, based upon the fair market value of the properties involved, would require the city and county to pay any difference in the value of their property, if it is of less value than the Federal property, to U.S. Treasury.

OBLIGATIONS FOR COMMISSARY STORE FACILITY CONSTRUCTION

Section 802 would amend Title 10, United States Code, Section 2685, to permit the obligation of funds for approved commissary construction projects on the basis of anticipated revenues. Current law stipulates that the obligations of any funds for the construction of commissaries may not exceed the cash on hand in the commissary store trust revolving fund. Because commissary sales and the revenue collected through the surcharge fee are stable and can be predicted with a high degree of accuracy the committee has recommended the amendment. (For additional discussion, see Areas of Special Emphasis elsewhere in this report.)

LAND CONVEYANCE, BELL, CALIF.

Section 803 would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to the City of Bell, Calif., approximately 5.5 acres of land in exchange for the construction of a new armory that meets Department of Army specifications. The U.S. Government would hold title to the armory. The exchange, based upon the fair market value of the property and armory construction involved, requires the city to pay any difference in value should the cost of the new armory be less than the value of the land it receives, to the U.S. Treasury.

MANAGEMENT OF DEFENSE REAL PROPERTY

Section 804 is discussed fully elsewhere in this report under Areas of Special Emphasis.

AUTHORIZATION TO USE MONIES RECEIVED FROM GRAZING AND AGRICULTURAL LEASES

Section 805 authorizes the use of rental receipts derived from agricultural and grazing leases on military lands to (a) finance multiple land use management programs on military installations and (b) cover administrative costs associated with such leasing. It is not intended that this money be used for capital improvements, which are normally provided for in the annual Military Construction Authorization and Appropriation Acts.

The Department of Defense controls nearly 25 million acres of land throughout the United States and its possessions. To ensure optimal use of the natural resources in these lands, military installations apply a multiple-use principle, which seeks as its objective the balanced and coordinated management of all resources, based on the best combination of developmental and protective land uses consistent with military requirements.

Under the Military Leasing Act (10 U.S.C. 2667) the services apply the multiple-use principle through leasing of over 1.1 million acres of lands for agricultural and grazing purposes. These leases generate approximately \$6 million in annual rental proceeds as well as \$6 million worth of other benefits in the form of maintenance, protection, repair, or restoration projects performed by the lessees. Section (b)(5) of the Act essentially limits such maintenance, protection, repair, or restoration by the lessee to the leased property. Thus valuable and necessary land management programs cannot be performed by lessees for portions of the installation that are not actually under lease. Moreover, section (d) of the Act requires that money rentals be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. Consequently, land management programs covering areas not under lease must be funded from the installation operation and maintenance funds. In most instances these funds are limited and must be used for mission oriented functions. As a result, many important natural resource initiatives which would promote optimal use of military lands are not undertaken. Installation commanders have little incentive to encourage these programs since they must divert scarce manpower and operational funds to administer them.

The General Accounting Office, in its November 1981 report, "DOD Can Increase Revenues Through Better Use of Natural Resources It Holds in Trust", recognized the potential for increasing the amount of military lands which can be outleased for agricultural and grazing purposes and thus the amount of income and benefits that could be derived from the program. One of the major recommendations in the report toward that end was for legislative changes to the applicable leasing laws as proposed herein.

Amendment of section 2667(d) of title 10, United States Code, to allow use of lease proceeds for administration and multiple land use management expenses will provide the necessary incentive to installation commanders to expand their programs. A more aggressive leasing program could be pursued through hiring of technicians to identify, make available and improve lands not presently outleased. Land, water, fish, wildlife, forestry, and landscaping programs could also be better integrated into the overall operation

and management of each installation. The additional income generated by the expanded leasing program will more than cover the administrative and multiple land use management expenses with a net increase in funds deposited with the Treasury.

Section 7 of the Act of August 18, 1941, as amended (33 U.S.C. 701C-3), provides for payment to the States of 75 percent of the annual rental receipts deposited into the Treasury from leases of lands acquired by the United States for flood control, navigation and allied purposes, including hydroelectric power. The proposed legislation would not affect this practice since such lands are excluded from its scope.

Enactment of this proposed legislation will cause no increase in budgetary requirements for the Department of Defense.

REVISION OF FOREIGN LEASING DOLLAR LIMITATION

Section 806 increases the amount that may be expended for leasing in the fiscal year 1982 Military Construction Authorization Act, P.L. 97-99. This increase is made without increasing the total amount authorized for family housing operations and maintenance in the fiscal year 1982 Act. The purpose of the increase is to accommodate increased lease costs in Korea.

LAND EXCHANGE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Section 807 authorizes the Navy to undertake an important construction project at the Washington Navy Yard at a total amount not to exceed \$5,000,000. The project encompasses the renovation of an underutilized building which will be used to house the administrative offices of the Military Sealift Command (MSC). The personnel of MSC who will move to the renovated building currently occupy 17,000 square feet of office space in Silver Spring, Maryland and 48,000 square feet of leased space in the District of Columbia. MSC's leases expire in 1984 and are unrenewable. Although available funds will initially be used for the renovation project, the work will ultimately be funded out of proceeds from the sale of a Navy-owned building in Silver Spring, Maryland, which can be disposed of when certain key segments of a Navy Yard project are actually completed. To permit this somewhat complex series of transactions to be accomplished, the Secretary of the Navy is given authority to dispose of the Silver Spring property. He may sell or transfer on any terms he considers in the public interest as long as fair market value is obtained. Thereafter, he may take the proceeds from the sale or other disposition of the property, and reimburse the appropriations which initially funded the new construction. Section 807 also provides that if the disposal proceeds exceed the authorized cost of the new construction, the balance will be available to fund future military construction projects authorized by the Congress. In this way, the Department of the Navy will be able to reduce its future military construction budget request by at least that amount. The committee emphasizes that this is not part of the Navy's larger effort to relocate 18,000 people from leased space into the Navy Yard. This provision solves an immediate problem, at no net cost to the taxpayer, and simply relocates a small number of Navy employees in the District of Columbia.

LAND EXCHANGE, KANSAS CITY, MO.

Section 808 authorizes the Secretary of the Army to convey to the Kansas City Corporation for Industrial Development approximately 1.2 acres of land and improvements, currently used as a Reserve Center, in exchange for 4.5 acres and a school which the Corporation will renovate for use as a Reserve Center. This is a no-cost, fair market value land exchange.

LIMITS ON RAPID DEPLOYMENT FORCE CONSTRUCTION

Section 809 repeats a provision from the fiscal year 1982 Act, P.L. 97-99, that requires the use of U.S. construction materials on construction projects in support of the U.S. Rapid Deployment Force. The provision has been amended slightly to permit use of construction materials produced, manufactured, or refined in the host nation.

○

